THE CAUSE OF WOMAN.

INTERESTING QUESTION RAISED BY A KENTUCKIAN'S BOOK.

In "Republics Versus Woman" Mrs. Wolsey Attempts to Show That Her Sex Has a Higher Position Under Monarchies Than Under Republics—Her Argument, and the Other Side of the Case.

When a woman writes a book to prove that the position of her sex is higher under a monarchy than under a republic—or, in other words, the United States, for that is the one principally considered—she cannot fail to arouse controversy. This has been done by a Kentuckian, Mrs. Wolsey, in a little volume entitled "Republics versus Woman." While all her statements are one-sided there is a strong foundation of truth for some of them. She scouts the idea that "the republics of France, Brazil, Mexico or any others give to womankind the position, influence or esteem granted by any aristocracy of Europe," and says: "It is always the classes, never the masses, who set up elevated ideals of womanhood, and it is only where the influence of the classes is paramount that woman need look for the highest recognition."

If by the "masses" Mrs. Wolsey means the great body of the illiterate, untrained and undeveloped, who are engaged in a daily hand-to-mouth struggle and have few instincts beyond the animal, then it may be answered that they have no "elevated ideals" of either manhood or womanhood. But if she includes what in the United States are known as the "middle classes," then the reply can be emphatically made that not only do they possess a high ideal of womanhood, but that this is the one and only country in all the world which affords an opportunity for realizing these ideals.

The position of woman is not one of republics or monarchies but of race, and the Anglo-Saxon race alone has approached a recognition of her equality of rights. The South American republics are not worth considering in this connection. Mexico has grasped the republican idea, but her people in their thoughts and customs are thoroughly Spanish, clinging to old traditions and under the domination of a mediæval Catholic church. In Europe it is true that the legal position of women is no better in the republics of France and Switzerland than in the absolute monarchies of Russia and Germany, and their political position is not nearly so good. In the two republics women have no vote or voice whatever in public matters, while in the majority of the monarchical countries they have some form of suffrage, ranging from all but the Parliamentary vote in Great Britain, Sweden and Norway, to municipal suffrage in some and a ballot by male proxy in various others. It must be remembered, however, that in all of these countries it is not the man or the woman but the property that votes. The Government does not recognize individual but only property rights.

For any acknowledgement, however, of the equal rights of women in a large sense we must come to the Anglo-Saxon race. The oldest Government by this race is found in Great Britain, a constitutional monarchy, which did not allow any participation by men in general until about two generations ago when John Bright secured the franchise for workingmen who paid taxes. A generation later, through the efforts of John Stuart Mill and Jacob Bright, this privilege was obtained for women, who like men must pay taxes or rents, but it does not include the most important vote of all—the Parliamentary—and the vast majority of married women are deprived of any suffrage. There is, however, the recognition of a principle which has as yet gained scarcely a foothold in the United States. The nearest approach to a genuine republic which the world has yet seen is found in New Zealand and Australia, where the women have full national or federal suffrage on the same terms as men. But in the former they are forbidden a seat in the Parliament and barred from most of the offices and boards, while in the latter they are deprived of the State suffrage in half of the subdivisions of the commonwealth, so that a true democracy is far from being achieved. It must be admitted, however, even by the most patriotic American, that Great Britain and her colonies have granted political rights to women which have been almost wholly denied them by the United States.

In her arraignment of this country Mrs. Wolsey says:

> The founders of the republic ignored and ostracized the very women who had suffered and struggled at their sides. Under its very flag, which a woman first made and unfurled to the heavens, they did not recognize her equal rights; in its very government, which woman had helped to establish, they did not grant her equal liberty. The discovery of the very continent upon which they established their theories was due to a woman, and yet they made her sex captive therein. A woman could be queen and could occupy the very zenith and pinnacle of all power in the government to which these women had belonged—yet they stripped power from every member of her sex and made all bondswomen to the lowest races and orders of manhood.

All this is Gospel truth, but it must be remembered in extenuation that the idea of self-government and equality for men themselves was the most radical and marvellous ever entertained. The ignorance and inexperience of the women of those times and their total absorption in their large families and heavy domestic duties precluded all thought of their participation in a Government which was the most momentous experiment ever made. This does not, however, furnish the slightest excuse for their exclusion at the present day, when all of those old disabilities have been removed. The writer quotes the great Li Hung Chang as saying: "Nothing I observed in my tour of the world caused me such surprise as the position of women in the American Republic—I found it as far below that of her sex in Christian monarchies as I had expected to find it above. All I had heard about the 'queenship' of American women, inquiry proved to be the merest pretence and humbug. Her crown is tinsel, her throne is nil. The Republic has increased the rights and privileges of its men over its women to a degree that is not tolerated by a monarchy. There is no Government which is necessarily so antagonistic to all women as a republic, none in which the entire female sex may logically hope for so little." Mrs. Wolsey adds to this the declaration: "Republicanism is, in its entire nature and construction, a masculine monopoly. It is woman's implacable foe—between her and it an irreconcilable conflict exists."

Both of the above are extreme statements, but they have a substantial basis. The position of woman in the United States is an anomaly such as is not found elsewhere. This country parades itself before the world as the incarnation, the apotheosis of liberty and equality, and while it is offering these priceless gifts to the outcasts of the whole earth it is denying them to its own women. It is difficult to see how an intelligent foreigner could view the situation in any other way than that expressed by Li Hung Chang—still more difficult to understand the spirit of American manhood which perpetrates this injustice, and the spirit of American womanhood which endures it. It cannot be admitted, however, that a republic is woman's implacable foe. On the contrary it contains her highest hope, for its fundamental principle of universal freedom cannot fail, in the process of time, to include woman as well as man. Already it has done so in all but political rights and their adjuncts. In no other country do women possess a tithe of the liberty, the privileges and the opportunities they enjoy in the United States. It may be true that in the monarchies women of the nobility, of the old families, of wealth and position, have exceptional powers and advantages; but for the middle classes and the poor there is little chance in the social or the industrial world, and they are hedged and hampered in a thousand ways of which American women experience nothing.

The latter have infinitely more freedom even without the ballot than have those of any other country with it, and while all by no means have equal opportunities, the door is not wholly closed to any. The Stars and Stripes do not float over absolutely free women but they do wave over the freest women in the world in social, civil, legal and educational rights. No one woman may sit on a throne, but all women have a higher seat than is accorded to those of any other nation. And the political rights will as surely come as the other rights will surely stay.

An Illinois law makes the family expenses equally chargeable upon husband or wife and this has been held to include any sort of an outfit for himself which a husband may choose to purchase. A Massachusetts couple were sojourning temporarily in Chicago and the husband made a number of purchases without the wife's knowledge. When they returned home the creditors levied on her property for payment. The Supreme Court of Massachusetts has just decided that the Illinois law does not reach to the old Bay State. In 1901 a New York couple took up their residence in Chicago and when they went back to their former home the husband's Illinois creditors attached the wife's New York property for his individual debts. The Supreme Court of this State decided that it was a legal proceeding, as the parties were residents of Illinois when the debts were contracted.

All of this goes to show that wives who own property should avoid taking their husbands to Illinois to reside or to visit.

A lady in this city asks why this department did not call Dr. Rainsford to account for his remarks at the dinner given to District Attorney Jerome by the Good Government Club a week or two ago, the substance of which was that "there is no use to try to close the saloons on Sunday," and that "the brothels should be left alone but kept in order." According to the newspaper report, this was received by the Good Government Club "with applause." His closing sentence, that "reformers are a dandy crew, but they are infernally poor hands at team work," called forth "great applause." Our correspondent says she is not a Church woman and she is glad of it, but she doesn't see how Dr. Rainsford can reconcile such sentiments with the belief in an Almighty God and the final triumph of good. She expected an avalanche of protest from women, but, although they can go into hysterics over such questions as shutting dogs out of apartment houses, they have not had a word to say on Dr. Rainsford's utterances.

Perhaps the women agree with Mme. de Staël—"The more I see of men the better I like dogs." Perhaps the subject of dogs is more suited to their mental calibre than that of moral reform. Perhaps they thought that when the Good Government Club, which has taken the morals of the city into its special keeping, received the reverend gentleman's sentiments with great applause it would be impertinent for outsiders to criticise. Perhaps they considered that as they were in nowise responsible for putting the present reform administration into power they would let it flounder without interruption. Perhaps they recognized that while they might be able to scare the janitor of an apartment house they could not have the slightest effect on present or prospective city officials.

As a matter of fact, most women talk too much, but that is because they can't do anything except talk—with some weeping and praying on the side. A few of them, however, do considerable observing and thinking, and these have formed the judgment that when a minister climbs down from his clerical heights in order to get nearer to the "people," he is apt to go a stratum or so too low and get beneath the respect of those whose good opinion is worth having.

The old-time clergyman kept an immense gulf between him and his flock. His modern successor sometimes drops into the gulf. It is difficult for him to mix with politicians and keep himself pure and unspotted from the world. Imperfect humanity has depended on the ministers to fix the ideals and lead up to them. If on the contrary they are going to say, "These evils have gained a firm foothold and there is nothing to do but let them alone," where do they improve upon the politician, and whence is the leader to come for those men and women who think there should at least be a vigorous and sustained effort toward improving conditions?

The Newbury (S. C.) *Herald-News* says: "Among the officers elected by the National Suffrage Convention at New Orleans not one was from the South. So much the better for the women of the South."

Miss Laura Clay, of Lexington, Ky., has been first auditor since 1895 and was reëlected. Miss Kate M. Gordon, of New Orleans, has been corresponding secretary two years and was reëlected. So much the better for the women of the South.

One of the New Hampshire legislators who signed the invitation for Lyman Abbott and the other "antis" to come up and speak against the suffrage amendment was Winston Churchill. Another was Judge Remick. Both men put the names of their wives, without their consent, on the committee announced to entertain the speakers. These two ladies are strong believers in woman suffrage, they so informed the "antis," came to the platform at the suffrage meetings and made their position clear. This is a specimen of the way a great many husbands represent their wives on this question.

When the French Ministry of Education recently decreed that women might compete for the Grand Prix de Rome, which enables the winner to study painting, sculpture, architecture and music four years in Italy and Greece at Government expense, it was predicted there would be trouble. Now two of them give promise of gaining it, and the male students are making vigorous protest. Allee samee Melican man in the universities on this side of the water.

IDA HUSTED HARPER.

IMMUNE TO BEE POISON.

Apiarists Get So They Don't Much Mind Being Stung.

From the Indianapolis Journal.

That a person who has been often stung by bees becomes in time immune to the poison of the sting is asserted by Dr. H. F. Parker. He reports that when he first began to keep bees he was frequently stung, and that each sting was attended with acute pain; but that as time went on the pain and swelling became less. In the following year, while transferring a hive of bees, he had an experience which he thus relates:

> "Sting followed sting in succession, in legs, arms, fingers, neck and face. I imagined what a picture I would present—closed eyes and swollen hands and feet. I worked on, and so did the bees. I could feel the needle-like thrust, but then it did not seem to pain as much, and at last I finished the task. With aching head, slight nausea and vertigo slowly coming on I left my task with a sigh of relief for what was accomplished and filled with wonderment as to what my personal appearance would be.
>
> "Imagine my astonishment to find merely slightly raised red spots, like little pimples, with the red sting in the centre, as the result of each and every sting. I must have had something like forty of them on various parts of my body. My clothes were full of them; but, they being so thick, did not allow the sting to penetrate. The dizziness, nausea and headache left me and 'Richard was himself again.'
>
> "When I again visited my bees I did not dread the stinging properties any longer, at least, not as much so as formerly, and then, and ever since, I have found that when a bee does sting me the pain is only sharp for an instant and there is an absence of the after-swelling.
>
> "I have since been stung many more times than I was at that time, and yet none of the symptoms above referred to have been reproduced. Am I not, therefore, immune of the poison of the honey bee, at least to a certain extent?
>
> "All authorities on bee culture state the fact, as a crumb of comfort to novices, in beekeeping, that the poison of a bee will produce less and less effect upon their systems. 'Old beekeepers,' it is said, 'like Mithridates, appear almost to thrive on the poison itself.' Hulsh speaks of 'seeing the bald head of Bonner, a celebrated practical apiarist, covered with stings, which seemed to produce upon him no unpleasant effect.' Rev. Mr. Kleine advises beginners to allow themselves to be stung frequently, assuring them that 'in two seasons their systems will become accustomed to the poison.'
>
> "In conclusion, let me state that I firmly believe that the beekeeper becomes inoculated with the poison of the bee, and usually becomes proof, or at least immune, against it, is no more to be doubted than the fact that vaccination is a preventive against smallpox."

POEMS WORTH READING.

The Peace Conference.

(July, 1899.)

From "Blind Children."

Upon War's shield and shadowed by his sword,
Behold the pigmies who dare dream to slay
The giant, who, altho he dose to-day,
To-morrow shall newcram his gorge abhorred.
Long yet his blood-libation stall be poured!
Long yet the peoples shall acclaim his sway!

Our earth cools faster than the ancient zest
Of blood, the dull hereditary hate,
The prejudices inarticulate,
The greed and jealousy that unexpress
Still smolder in the patriotic breast
And must upflame in ire inveterate.

Yet dreams are half-deeds, and this solid world
Is built on visions; wherefore let no scorn
Greet those who in the midnight grope for morn,
And dream that War's red banner shall be furled,
And War's foul reek of smoke and blood be curled
No more about an earth renewed, reborn.

ISRAEL ZANGWILL.

The Sick Child.

From the London Spectator.

He for whom the world was made
Cannot lift his heavy head,
All its pretty curls puffed out,
Burnt with fevers, parched with drought.

He, the tyrant, whimsical,
With the round world for his ball,
In a dreadful patience lies,
Old since yesterday and wise.

Like a martyr on the rack
Smiles, his soft lips burnt to black,
While the fever still devours
His small body, sweet as flowers.

Dreadful patience like a sword
Stabs his mother's heart, dear Lord;
Make him naughty, wild and gay,
As he was but yesterday.

Little services he pays
With his kisses and his praise,
While his eyes ask pardon still
That he's troublesome and ill.

He lies smiling with a fire
In his cheeks blown high and higher,
By the wind of fever fanned.
Lord, his kisses on my hand!

Give me back my boy, I pray,
Turbulent, or yesterday;
Not this angel, like a sword
In his mother's heart, dear Lord!

KATHARINE TYNAN.

Hepatica.

From the Youth's Companion.

When April is in her gentle mood
And leafy smells are in the wood,
In sunny nook, by bank or brook,
Behold this lovely sisterhood.

A spirit sleeping in the mould,
And tucked about by leafage old,
Opens an eye blue as the sky,
Nor deems that she is overbold.

Before a leaf is on the tree,
Before I see a bumblebee,
She hears a voice, "Arise! rejoice!"
And in furry vestments greeteth me.

Before the oven-bird has sung,
Or thrush or chewink found a tongue,
She ventures out and looks about,
And once again the world is young.

Sometimes she stands in white array,
Sometimes as pink as dawning day,
Or even shade of azure made,
And oft with breath as sweet as May.

Sometimes she bideth all alone,
And lifts her cup beside a stone,
A child at play along the way,
When all her happy mates have flown.

Again in bands she beams around,
And brightens all the littered ground,
And holds the gaze in leafless ways—
A concert sweet without a sound.

Like robin's song or bluebird's wing,
Or throats that make the marshes ring,
Her beaming face and winsome grace
Are greetings from the heart of spring.

JOHN BURROUGHS.

The Wicklow Hills.

From the Georgetown College Journal.

O, the Wicklow hills,
Sure their grass is greener,
Their air is keener,
Their sky more blue,
Than lands they tell of,
And ports they spell of
That lie away to the east o' you.

I know a place
Where my heart is hidden:
My mind, unbidden,
Is ever there;
A little nook, an'
A wimplin' brook, an'
A long black shade when the sun is fair.

A tiny corner,
Of earth the sweetest,
The fairest, neatest,
This little vale,
Where wild buds bloom, an'
Waste sweet perfume, an'
The wise wind whispers its wistful wail.

Ah, heart o' mine,
I have been a rover,
The wide world over
In lands afar;
But you were true to
A spot we knew, to
The little valley of Amacher.

In this fair land
Where the sun is shining,
For the lilt I'm pining
O' rippling rills,
When the dusk is falling,
'Tis then you're calling,
Oh, heart o' mine, for the Wicklow hills!

The Fisherman.

From the Boston Transcript.

The wind whistles shrill, the glass is still falling,
The skies are dark with the unshed snow;
Far out in the harbor the gulls are calling,
Out in the bay you can hear them calling:
Cast her adrift, up mainsail and go.

With the kiss of our dearest,
Our best-loved and nearest,
Still fresh on our lips,
We must sail, must sail,
For the fish must be caught;
We may tarry for naught,
So out and away in the teeth of the gale.

Down past the wharves we are silently gliding,
Down past the islands and into the bay,
Down past the steamers at anchor riding,
Huge floating freighters in safety riding,
Out in the fume, the fret and the spray.

For when fish can be taken
All must be forsaken;
No matter who calls,
We must sail, must sail,
Though the wife be a-sighing
And the children a-crying,
We must earn our bread in the teeth of the gale.

Though the ropes be stiff and the sleet be stinging,
What matter it, if the fish bite free,
For deep in our hearts we can hear a-singing,
Yea! well-loved voices we hear a-singing,
Welcome home from the gale and the sea.

For again to our dearest,
Best-loved and nearest,
With the wind astern
We shall sail, shall sail.
When the fish are all caught,
We shall tarry for naught,
But up and away from the teeth of the gale.

A Parallel.

From the Indianapolis Sentinel.

Delicate, white and slender,
Chic, as the Frenchman saith;
Perfumed, and blowing tender
Kisses with fragrant breath;
Dainty and sweet, like a woman,
Fashioned like her—and yet
Something perchance less human—
Gay little cigarette!

Soothing, when most I need it,
Each little care and pain,
Bidding me never heed it—
It will not come again;
To all my moods the kindest,
The readiest to forget
My sins—to my faults the blindest—
Dear little cigarette!

Yet like a woman? Truly
There are some points that tell;
Not carried out unduly
I find a parallel:
There is the Turkish yonder—
Thank you—a match. Now get
Ready to hear and ponder
The Tale of a Cigarette.

Touched by the fire of passion,
Pressed to your lips, and lo!
How warm in first love fashion
That quick responsive glow!
You call to mind how sweet it
Seemed when your lips first met?
There is the box—repeat it
Smoking a cigarette!

The smoke rings you are blowing,
Those are the dreams you had—
The joys she was bestowing
On you, her lover lad:
Those are the clouds of fancy
Raised by the amulet
Of youth's sweet necromancy—
Or—by a cigarette!

How soon it all is finished!
How useless to pretend
That pleasure's undiminished—
'Tis bitter at the end!
The tears may wet your lashes
In semblance of regret,
But here's a heap of ashes,
A smoked-out cigarette!

Marjorie, Maude, Cecilia—
How soon your day was done!
Dorothy, Phyllis, Delia—
Yet we have had our fun!
Come back to me? No, never—
Ethel, Marie, Juliette!
But—in the box there's ever
Another cigarette!

EDWIN MEADE ROBINSON.

SCIENCE.

The Smallest Living Organisms.

Certain microbes are known to exist which are very much too small to be seen as individuals under the most powerful microscopes. Their existence is made known only by the slight opalescence which they impart to the liquids in which they swarm, and by their effects in producing diseases such as horse-sickness, bovine peripneumonia and the like. There is little hope that microscopes will be perfected so that these invisible microbes can be seen. The microscope is very near to theoretical perfection now. Its resolving power cannot be pushed beyond the detection of elements having a breadth of 0.10 to 0.13 of a micron (a micron is 1-1000 of a millimetre; that is, a millionth part of a metre or about one-twenty-five thousandth part of an inch). The small microbes of which we are speaking have just about these dimensions. One of the bacteria present in putrefaction has linear dimensions a million times less than those of man and a hundred million times less than those of the great trees of California. Is there any reason to suppose that there are bacteria a million or a hundred million times smaller than the one just mentioned?

The question has lately been studied by M. Errara, who starts with the hypothesis, derived from both physics and chemistry, that matter is not infinitely divisible, that it is composed of atoms of a certain minimum size. Granting this, it follows that animals and plants, even the most simple, are complexes made up of molecules, themselves made up of congeries of atoms, and therefore of a minimum size not indefinitely small. Taking the microbe *Micrococcus progrediens* as a basis of calculation (its diameter is about 0.15 of a micron), he finds that it must contain about 10,000 atoms of sulphur and certainly less than 30,000 albuminoid molecules. As the volumes of like organisms are proportional to the cubes of their like dimensions, a microbe of 0.05 microns in diameter would contain not more than 400 atoms of sulphur, and a microbe of 0.01 microns not more than three or four such. To make the microbe the organization that it is, sulphur is required; and it follows that, if the molecular theory taken as a starting point be true, the dimensions of the smallest microbes possible cannot be indefinitely smaller than the dimensions of the smallest now known to us.

THE SOLAR PROTUBERANCES.

It is well known that the solar protuberances show velocities that are very hard to reconcile with the accepted explanations of other solar phenomena. In a series of memoirs printed during 1900-03 Herr W. H. Julius has set forth a theory which seems satisfactory. Without going into great detail, its main points can be given here. The external layers of a gaseous body like the sun cool faster and they fall toward the sun's surface to be replaced by hotter ascending gas. The convection currents would be radial, if the sun was not in rotation. Its rotary motion gives the descending masses an increasingly greater angular velocity, and the contrary is true for the ascending masses, so that gaseous layers of different densities forming whirlpools—vortexes—are present at the same place at the same time. The chromosphere with its protuberances is nothing but this system of waves and of whirlpools rendered visible at greater or less distances from the solar surface by solar light having its origin in the lower layers and abnormally dispersed in the upper regions. The smaller whirlpools and the perpetual swells of the surfaces of discontinuity separating the gaseous layers constitute the chromosphere, while the protuberances are the larger, more extensive, whirlpools. There is thus no question of the actual transfer of matter from place to place at enormous velocities, but the quick succession of the same conditions at two different places. At each point a whirlpool is formed, just as we see the foam of a long line of surf breaking on a beach. The conditions at each end of the beach are the same and the line of foam seems to travel from end to end; but we know very well, in this case, that there is no transfer of material. The analogy will serve to interpret a part of the new theory of solar protuberances.

REMARKABLE RADIATION PHENOMENON.

M. Giratez publishes in No. 5 of the *Physikalische Zeitschrift* an account of a remarkable radiation phenomenon photographically registered. He exposed a negative, in absolute darkness, to the action of H^2O^2, placing the sensitive film several centimetres above this liquid and putting on the opposite side of the plate some metallic object—a copper cross, for instance. After development the plate showed a clear image of the cross on a dark ground, although the cross was not situated in the path of the rays. It is even possible to obtain an image of the cross when certain substances are interposed between the cross and the plate; and some liquids even reënforce the image. There is then a specific action peculiar to the liquid. Speaking generally, these phenomena are accentuated when there is a chemical reaction between the cross and the interposed liquid. The experimenter has then succeeded in automatically registering, by photography, certain chemical reactions. The smallest variations of temperature affect the images, the warmest parts of the plate being clearer than the rest. The thermic state of the plate is thus automatically registered. The heat of these changes has not yet been fixed; but it can be affirmed that they are not due to the direct action of the vapor of H^2O^2, of oxygen, of ozone, nor to the effect of negative ions.

PARALLAX DETERMINED BY SPECTROSCOPY.

Most stellar parallaxes are determined by obscuring the relative positions of two stars, A and B, throughout a year. If A is nearer to us than B, then the annual revolution of the earth will make A describe a very small orbit in the sky about B. This is the method proposed by Galileo. It is difficult, delicate and laborious. It gives the relative parallax of the two stars. The absolute parallax of a binary star is known as soon as its orbit is fully determined and its motion in the line of light measured. The determination of the orbit is a long and troublesome work; the spectroscopic measures of its motion are very delicate, but not necessarily long. The latter method has just been applied at the Lick Observatory by Prof. Hussey in the case of the star *Delta Equulei*, whose periodical time in its orbit is about 5 7-10 years, and apparent distance at periastron 0.15 second of arc. The mean distance is about 0.28 second and the eccentricity 0.46. The apastron distance is 0.41.

The relative velocity of the two components of the star in the line of light is about 29½ miles per second. From these data the resulting parallax is 0.107 second, which must be a close approximation. As the elements of the orbit are improved, as they will be year by year, the value of the parallax will be bettered. The mass of the system is about 1 9-10 the sun's mass, and each of the two stars composing it is about equal to the sun in mass. Both stars belong to the solar type, and each has, very probably, a density about the same as that of the sun. The mean distance from each other at which these stars perform their revolutions is about four times the distance of the earth from the sun. At periastron the two stars are seperated by 186,000,000 miles; at apastron by 465,000,000.

THE POPULATION OF ENGLAND.

The French Chamber of Commerce in London has just published a bulletin respecting the results of the last census of England, from which it appears that on March 31, 1901, the total population of England and Wales was about 32,500,000 as against 29,000,000 on the 6th of April, 1891, and 25,900,000 the 4th of April, 1881. In 1901 the population of Scotland was 4,400,000, of Ireland the same, although in 1841 the latter country counted more than 8,000,000. The total population of Great Britain and Ireland is thus nearly 41,500,000 at present; of London, 4,536,034, and of London and its suburbs, 6,578,784. There are 571,768 occupied and 40,069 unoccupied houses in London and 1,019,546 families, comprising, on the average, 4 4-10 persons per family. Foreigners abound in London and the principal nations are thus represented: Russia, 38,117; Germany, 27,427; Russian Poland, 13,420; France, 11,264; Italy, 10,889. Of the Frenchmen, 684 are head cooks, 391 commercial clerks, &c., 1,205 house servants and 399 teachers.

POST OFFICE STATISTICS.

The following table gives the official statistics of the United States Post Office Department for 1902. Number of post offices, 75,924; extent of post routes in miles, 507,540; miles of mail service performed during the year, 474,234,687; gross revenue of Post Office Department, $121,848,847; gross expenditure, $124,892,472; paid to postmasters, $20,783,019; ordinary postage stamps issued, 4,629,987,473; stamped envelopes and wrappers issued, 853,128,000; postal cards issued, 549,204,000; number of letters registered, 22,831,400; dead letters received, 9,300,351; money realized from dead letters, $19,249; amount of domestic money orders issued, $313,551,279; amount of foreign money orders issued, $22,974,473; number of pieces of matter of all kinds mailed during the year, 8,085,449,856.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

We were wrong in saying that a person is first cousin once removed to his mother's first cousin; he is second cousin. Similarly, he is second cousin once removed to the child of his second cousin.

Can you tell me where I can find the short poem which starts as follows: "How do I love thee? A little drop of rain splashed down on the mountain's top; It joined two more." &c.? W. M. M.

It may be Mary Howitt's, or the Careys'.

E. F. G. asks if D'Artagnan was a real Frenchman. He not only was, but he left behind three large volumes of memoirs, and Dumas only did for him what Mrs. Ward has more recently done for Mlle. de Lespenasse, only he left the setting and added some romance, while she has kept the story, but changed the setting. The memoirs are translated into English, "Memoirs of Monsieur D'Artagnan, Captain-Lieutenant of the First Company of the King's Musketeers," by Ralph Nevill, and published by H. S. Nichols of London. L. D. B.

Can any of your readers tell me where to find in published form a song which sailors used to sing, the refrain of which was: "The land crabs will get you in Jamaica," or, if it has not published, will any one supply the words? B. T.

Four friends write about "Topside Galah," the pigeon-English version of "Excelsior." One says that it is to be found in "Wayside Rhymes;" the other, that it is in "Gems for the Fireside," the third places it in *Harper's Monthly* for October, 1899 (XXXIX., 783). A fourth, H. S. writes as follows:

Both the parodies for which your correspondent inquires, "Norval" and "Excelsior," are appended to the late Charles Godfrey Leland's "Pidgin-English Sing-Song," London: Trubner & Company, 1876. Mr. Leland says in his introduction: "I have placed at the end of this work the well-known and popular version of 'Norval,' which first appeared at least forty years ago, and that of 'Excelsior'—the names of the authors being unknown to me." In a note attached to "Excelsior" he adds: "This anonymous parody of 'Excelsior' was introduced to the reading public in *Macmillan's Magazine* and Mr. Stinson's entertaining work 'Meeting the Sun.'"

Old Luke Dawson, 82 years old, is evidently an old Irishman, with a meagre education, who has accumulated by hard work $5,000. He wants to go home to Ireland and spend his remaining days where he was born and brought up. That is the way I look at it, for why else should he inquire about Irish money? I think if you have old Luke Dawson's address it would be well to write him, and tell him how much English money he could get for $5,000. JAMES MCCONNELL.

Possibly your understanding of the question is correct. Mr. Dawson gave no address whatever; so we take Mr. McConnell's suggestion, and inform him here that he can get about 1,031 English sovereigns for his $5,000.

In the matter of the alleged order "Put none but Americans on guard to-night," Mr. Tudor Jenks writes:

After a long search some years ago I found the saying declared mythical in Lalor's "Cyclopædia of Political Science," under the heading "American Party."

Was Father Chiniquy, officially named "Apostle of Temperance in Canada," who separated from the Roman Catholic faith after fifty years in the Church, considered a good, conscientious man? Also what became of Maria Monk? F. M. M.

We think so. Maria Monk died in the Tombs some fifty years or so ago.

1. Is the energy of a woman of seventy years less than that of a man of the same age? 2. Have physiology and psychology anything to say on this? and if so, what do they say? 3. How does the energy of a man and a woman compare throughout life? JOHN DONELLY.

1. Probably. 2. They have; they seem to support us. 3. A man's energy is supposed to be greater than that of a woman through life.

I think that about the first time Quetelet took statistics it was found that throughout the civilized world to every 20 girls born there were 22.07 boys, including stillborns. Has not the proportion of female births to males increased since then? I know this is so in England, where the births stood in the last census 1,020 males to 1,000 females. Taking the civilized world as a whole, has there not been a rise in the female birthrate? J. M.

With the extension of civilization, and the decrease of war, the tendency is for the proportion of females to increase. According to the most recent cyclopædia, however, the New International, the proportion, even in civilized countries, is placed at 1,050 boys to 1,000 girls.

A bets B that the prefix "Mac" or "Mc" thus: "MacAdams" or "McIntosh," signifies that the former is Scotch and the latter Irish; also that the latter, *i. e.*, "Mc," should be pronounced "Mick". B thinks A is wrong and that "Mc" is simply an abbreviation of "Mac," which means "son of." Which is right? H. A. GRANTT.

"Mac, Mc, M'" are Gaelic prefixes, all derived from the Gothic *magus*, a son. In practice, Mac and M' seem to be used by Scots; Mc by Irish. All are pronounced "Mack," not "Mick."

Please inform me in your correspondents' column as to the origin of the title "Old Hickory" applied to Andrew Jackson. SUBSCRIBER.

James Parton, in his life of Jackson, says that the nickname grew. First the remark was made by some soldier, impressed by the General's pedestrian powers, that the General was tough. Then it was observed that he was as tough as hickory. Then he was called "Hickory," and finally the affectionate adjective "Old" was prefixed, and the title was complete.

Has telegraph messages been sent from moving trains, without using the wireless system which is now coming into use? If so on what railroad system and how long ago? If practicable, why discontinued? J. B.

Telegrams were sent from moving trains nineteen or twenty years ago. The New York and Northern road had some of its trains equipped with the sending apparatus in the autumn of 1884. The system was not successful commercially.

Please give the names of the twelve greatest English novels. NOVELS.

Thackeray's "Vanity Fair" and "Henry Esmond"; George Eliot's "Middlemarch"; Miss Austen's "Pride and Prejudice"; Goldsmith's "Vicar of Wakefield"; Scott's "Ivanhoe"; Hawthorne's "Scarlet Letter," Dickens's "Tale of Two Cities"; Reade's "Cloister and the Hearth"; Shorthouse's "John Inglesant"; Miss Bronte's "Jane Eyre," and Defoe's "Robinson Crusoe." Every one who reads, however, will have a different list; this is submitted tentatively.

1. Suppose a wife owns property in her own name, her husband disappears for several years and his residence is unknown before she purchased the property; when she dies, having secured no divorce, what becomes of the property? 2. Can the visible heirs cause proceedings to be instituted for a partition sale in Supreme Court, and what becomes of money for heirs not represented by attorney at such sales? 3. Can an adopted son have any interest, if he has previously received an interest in his own father's estate, even though his father was a brother to this woman? M. H. P.

1. The property would go to her heirs in time. They would probably have to go to court to have the husband declared dead; but if he should turn up he might get an interest in it. 2. The heirs can do so; the money is divided among all the heirs, whether represented or not. 3. Possibly; under the articles of adoption he might share as a natural-born child. Final answers cannot be given because you haven't stated the case fully. Go to a lawyer.

At what hour are the dummy sign clocks of clock and watchmakers usually set? A.

In this city, at 8:18, the hour at which the news of Lincoln's death became known to the principal painter of dummy clocks, on the morning of Saturday, April 15, 1865.

Kindly let me know the number of registered doctors and lawyers now practising their respective professions in the United States. L. M. G.

We don't know; the census returns don't say.

1. Can you tell me the name of the author of the following:

"Just for the sake of being called closer,
Just for the sake of a sycophant crowd,
You who might have lived to a ripe age and mellow
Are lying to-day neath the sod in your shroud."

2. Also what was the verdict, if they rendered one, of the jury in the trial of J. H. Surratt? Have been told that he was convicted by the jury, but escaped punishment because of the statute of limitations. I want the actual verdict of the jury. T. F. H.

1. We do not know. 2. If the statute of limitations, which, however, does not run against an indictment for murder, had been pleaded in Surratt's case and the plea had been sustained, the case would not have gone to the jury. As it was, the jury disagreed, and Surratt was discharged.

C. A. J.—The Democrats were filibustering in the Senate on the "Omnibus Statehood" bill, which Mr. Quay, Republican of Pennsylvania, wished to pass. They agreed with him. Then Mr. Morgan was filibustering on the Panama Canal bill.

H. L. D.—Most persons pronounce "Cedric" as if it were spelled See-drick; we have heard it pronounced "Sed-rick." It is a Saxon name, according to Sir Walter Scott. We don't know what it means.

Theo. L. A.—New York's famous blizzard occurred on Monday, March 12, 1888. The rain of Sunday turned to snow about 1 A. M. Monday.

H. A. M.—James K. Hackett was married on May 2, 1897, to Miss Florence Friend, whose stage name is Mary Mannering.

M. Lapinsky—Eugene Field wrote a poem called "Good-bye, God Bless You," we think.

PUBLICATIONS.

A Novel of Twentieth Century Manners and Customs in American Society

Golden Fleece

The AMERICAN ADVENTURES of a FORTUNE-HUNTING EARL

By David Graham Phillips

No picture of American society so unsparingly and amusingly faithful has ever before been presented

Illustrated by Harrison Fisher $1.50

McCLURE, PHILLIPS & CO., NEW YORK

SCHOOL FOR CARD PLAYERS.

Cassino. C. F. says: A holds a 5, a 9 and two aces. On the table are a 4 and an 8. He builds ace on 4 calling it 8. Instead of taking it in next time, he calls a 9 with his second ace on the 8. B objects that this is against the rules and bets A must take in the first build before making a second.

B is wrong. As long as a player makes or takes in a build, having a build already on the table he can do either, but he must not trail; that is, lay out a card which does nothing.

T. W. says: There are on the table a 6 and a king. A plays a king, but does not take in the one on the table. B bets he must take in a card if he can.

B. is wrong. A player will often refuse to take in so as to avoid a possible sweep against himself and also to get a better build next time. Suppose A has a 4, ace and 9 in his hand and a 4 is on the table. By laying out his own 4 he may build a 9 next time and save his ace. If he takes in the 4 this is impossible.

Auction Pitch. W. S. says: A has 3 to go; B wants 2 and C 1. A bids two and makes high low game to C's jack. Enclosed clippings are decision from a newspaper which flatly contradicts THE SUN'S decisions and say that the points go out in order high low jack game so that C wins. We want your reasons before paying over stake money.

It is a principle in all games of cards that when a player assumes any risk he shall have some compensating advantage. If there were no advantage to be gained no one would take the chance. The bidder risks being set back and to compensate for that risk he is allowed to have the first count regardless of the order of the points. If he can count out he is out, no matter what is scored by those who have taken no risk. When there is no bid the points go out in order as no one is entitled to any first count. So also when the bidder is not out the other players who have taken no risks must count their points in the order of their precedence.

Bridge. G. K. M. says: A is scoring. His adversaries make six by cards and thirty aces. A scores the 72 and 30, but forgets the little slam. After the cards are all dealt for the next hand, A's opponents call attention to the omission. A bets it is too late, because the little slam was not claimed before the new deal was completed.

There is nothing in the laws of bridge to the effect that a score must be "claimed." Honor scores, such as chicane or little slam, can be corrected at any time before the rubber score is agreed to, see law 14. If the deal referred to was the first deal of a new rubber, the last rubber being settled for, it was too late to ask for the correction, but not otherwise.

Euchre. E. A. H. says: Can a player order up without having a trump in his hand? Yes.

T. J. M. wants to know if the dealer should place the talon, with the turned trump on it, at his left or right? Usually at his left, so as to be convenient for the next player in order to deal the next hand.

Cribbage. G. H. F. says: Four men playing, the cards fall: 6, 7, 5, 2. Second round, 8, 4. B pegging a run of six. C says "go" and D plays a 2, calling another run of four. This B disputes.

The run is three only, as the duplicate deuce stops it at 2, 3, 4.

S. S. B. says: In a two-handed game, A plays a 6, B's last card is a 9, and he pegs the fifteen. Then A lays down a 7 and an 8. What can he count? Run of four and last card.

J. H. O. B. says: A plays an 8, B a 7 and A a 9. B says "go," and A plays a 7, calling a run of three and thirty-one.

There is no run for A, as the duplicate 7 comes before A's 8.

D. R. B. says: The cards fall: 6, 6, 8, 8, 7, 4. The last player claims seven holes for a run of five and thirty-one. A bets there is no run, as there are two sixes in it.

The run is correct, as you can go back to the first six without any duplicates.

W. E. H. says: In a three-handed game, the cards fall: 7, 8, 6. Then the first player lays down another 7 and calls five holes. The others say there is no run, only the thirty-one for A to score.

As A can go back from his last card to the 8 and 9 without