The Sun.

FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 1904.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

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

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

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

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

An Extremely Unsatisfactory Reply From Louisville.

We suggested the other day that before the money is actually paid on account of the Panama Canal, Col. HENRY WATTERSON ought to disclose the facts, or supposed facts, which impelled him to lend the authority of his name to the charge that half of the $40,000,000 is to go to thieves in France and the other half to thieves in America, including engineers, journalists and gray wolves in the United States Senate.

This seemed to us to be a very proper and reasonable suggestion, and we don't mind saying that it was prompted in a considerable degree by friendly solicitude for Col. WATTERSON'S reputation for sanity, journalistic honor and responsibility for his statements.

The Kentucky Colonel's response is not only unsatisfactory, but it is also such as to increase more than 100 per cent. our anxiety on his account. He does not withdraw the charge. He does not modify it in any particular. He reiterates it with new rhetorical adornments; and yet instead of supplying a single fact or specific assertion which would warrant any man in his senses, with due regard to his own self-respect and reputation, in bringing so astounding an indictment, he gives us the silly stuff of which the subjoined is a sample:

"THE NEW YORK SUN, having been put to sleep by the *Courier-Journal* quite four months ago, has waked up again. Like the groundhog, it comes out to see its shadow i' th' blossoming spring. Like ABU HASSAN, it grows jocund with the realization of its good fortune—like—like—why, like any other smug-faced Jook-o'-Dreams in topboots and russet jerkin, cocked hat, slashed trunks and plumes, it turns upon us and would give us the merry 'ha-ha!' It turns upon us with the self-righteous intrepidity and the unconscious self-exposure of the gentleman who holds in one hand the statute of limitations whilst with the other he clutches the cloak that but half conceals the stolen goods."

And after a column or two of this sort, with incidental remarks that betray quite as much ignorance of the recorded history of the canal business as lack of appreciation of his own personal predicament, Col. WATTERSON culminates with a shriek of the violent ward:

"Eureka! The twenty millions are safe to the thieves in Paris. The twenty millions are safe to the thieves in Washington. Better and better, the ten millions for the thieves in Bogota go to the thieves in Panama. Every cent of the money remains in the family. The Gray Wolves in the Senate lick their chops and slip silently to cover. Little Vanilla Bean dances the cancan between the Capitol and the White House, between the Waldorf-Astoria and the downtown headquarters of the French company. The Skunks of the Lobby, who do their own spriting and keep no books, are happy. The Bucket Shops of Paris are not less happy because they are inaccessible. Who cares for the looks of it? Who is afraid of ploughed ground? The plough at least will tell no tales, whilst Addition, Division and Silence will do the rest."

Col. HENRY WATTERSON was 64 years old last month. He possesses, or has possessed, a command of the English language, and likewise a command over his own faculties, sufficient to enable him to write coherently when he pleases.

If he has lost that power, or, what is worse, if he has lost that sense of journalistic responsibility and that habit of honorable demeanor without which his future career is sure to be exceedingly painful to his well wishers, we shall regard the loss not only as a public misfortune but also with private grief.

Polygamy and Senator Smoot's Case.

We are now receiving letters almost daily from a prosperous, very intelligent and morally exemplary German gentleman of New York, in which the institution of polygamy is seriously defended and highly commended. Of course, they are brought out by the Senate committee's inquiry into the case of Senator SMOOT of Utah, an "Apostle" of the Mormon Church.

These discussions, of course, are curious only. They are valueless as contributions toward the solution of any marriage problem at present agitating civilization or likely to arise at any time in the future. In his last letter, for example, our correspondent deals with the question as to the number of wives a man should be allowed to have. The Mormon President, as his testimony revealed, has contented himself with five wives, or, at least, has felt compelled to restrict himself to that number since the legislation of Congress concerning polygamy. Our German friend contends that "a man mentally and physically sound should naturally have not less than four or more than eight wives of about his own age." The correct average he puts at seven, in accordance with "the statement in the Bible," though he acknowledges that, after all, the number must be governed "by the state of one's finances."

Even in Mohammedan countries, where polygamy is a recognized and legal institution of religious sanction, that question of "the state of one's finances" enters in as an effectual restraint against the practice of polygamy. Only rich men can afford to keep up a retinue of wives, and accordingly polygamous marriages are few proportionately to the whole population. Economically, monogamy has a practical advantage over polygamy which cannot be questioned. Even rich Turks with harems suffer so seriously in the competition with the monogamous Greeks, for example, that they grow more and more disinclined to multiply their wives. Plural wives are not only costly to maintain, but naturally they have not the interest in the welfare of their husbands which monogamous wives have. They dissipate their substance without misgivings. Accordingly, polygamy is bound to give way under the competition, and already it is declining.

Moreover, our German friend is rich. If he was allowed to have the seven wives he puts as "the correct estimate" of the number he ought to be permitted to support because of "the state of his finances," would there not be a new provocation to social discontent? Of course, there would be exasperation because of the privileges secured to him by his wealth and denied to others because of their actual or relative poverty. Social distinctions would be made broader and sharper—between the men able to have only one wife, or two or three or four wives, and the men like him with money enough to keep his maximum number of seven wives. Of course, there would be no reason for it, but rather for sympathy with the trials of the unhappy husbands with a procession of wives; but, all the same, the polygamists would be pursued by wrath, or at least by ridicule. Polygamy does not work in civilization, and it is not worth talking about otherwise than as a comical suggestion.

The question of the polygamy of the Mormons is another matter, and it is a question, as the semi-religious *Independent* says in discussing it, about which honest moralists differ. Polygamy early vexed the Christian Church, which found it in existence and practised among converts. It has also raised a practical question of humanity with which Christian missionaries in polygamous countries have always had to deal. Must a polygamous convert discard his wives and thus consign them to reproach and suffering?

The *Independent* comes to the conclusion that no evidence as to polygamous practices by Senator SMOOT which could exclude him from Congress has yet appeared, and it is justified in the conclusion. The other matter brought up in the testimony, as to the influence and authority exercised by the Mormon Church over men who accept political office in Utah, raises a dangerous question. In the Revolution, Episcopalians were sometimes distrusted as of an Anglican religious allegiance. A chief cause of the Know Nothing agitation of the middle of the last century was the argument that Roman Catholics were under allegiance to the Papal sovereignty, to a foreign potentate, which was inconsistent with full loyalty to the Government of this republic. Obviously, there was nothing in it, for the allegiance of the Roman Catholic to the Pope of Rome is spiritual and not political; but the raising of the question caused much bad blood. If a Mormon is to be excluded from Congress simply for the reason that he is a Mormon, what remains of our constitutional principle of the freedom of religious conscience? We are glad to see, therefore, that the *Independent* is impelled to conclude its discussion of Mr. SMOOT's case by saying: "Much as we despise and detest Mormonism, we must wait further evidence that a Mormon cannot be admitted to Congress."

Philippine Railways.

The desirability of a system of railways in the Philippines is beyond all question. The profitable operation of such a system, from a strictly commercial point of view, is, for the immediate future, exceedingly doubtful. Railway construction may be said to operate in two directions—it may provide transportation in response to an existing need for improved facilities, or it may create traffic by opening fruitful but undeveloped areas. The Philippine lines would undoubtedly belong to the latter class.

Up to a certain point there is a parallel between railway enterprise in the Philippines and in Japan. The topographical conditions are generally similar. There is the same mountainous interior with its areas of potential fruitfulness, bordered by a coast strip of generally greater productive capacity. Japan's four thousand miles of railway lines are in prosperous condition, with traffic and passenger rates which are not prohibitory to even the poorer classes. It is true that Japan's population is about six times that of the Philippines, that her people are more energetic by nature and that they have reached a higher stage of civilization. Yet, so far as even the back country people of Japan are concerned, the railways have been of great value in their social and industrial development.

A similar result would assuredly follow in the Philippines. The special question is the time which will be required for a corresponding emancipation in the Philippines, making the railways of Luzon profitable as commercial enterprises. It would be unreasonable to expect them to pay from the start. Some Government provision for an indefinite period seems necessary.

In view of the varied interests of the United States in the whole Philippine problem, and the complications and possible dangers involved, there remains little room for doubt that the construction of the proposed lines would be a measure of economy, even though the proper maintenance should require for a time an annual appropriation from the United States Treasury.

The City and the Continent.

The completion of the first tunnel under the North River from Manhattan to the continent of America brings to a successful conclusion a project that began to attract attention thirty years ago. At that time the erection of elevated railroads in old New York was receiving the attention of capitalists and engineers, and the relief that these transportation lines afforded to the rapidly growing population was such that the necessity of building a tunnel to New Jersey was not so pressing as to make it imperative. The needs of the metropolis for an outlet to the country were served further by the building of the Brooklyn Bridge, which made Brooklyn practically one piece with Manhattan.

At no time, however, were the advantages to be gained by a permanent link uniting Manhattan to the mainland lost sight of. Several bridges to span the North River have been projected, one to enter the island at Twenty-third street and another to land at Fifty-ninth street. At present several tunnels under the North River are planned, which promise, when they are completed, to make the trip to New Jersey more easy of accomplishment than that to The Bronx. It will be interesting to watch the course of real estate values in Westchester county, Long Island and New Jersey when the subterranean lines are in operation.

The completion of the first North River tunnel, so close at hand, means that Manhattan is truly joined to her opposite neighbor by a physical link more impressive than any bridge would be. Heretofore Manhattanese have looked upon themselves as cut off from the rest of the nation by water. The ferries might be interrupted by bad weather; the bridges in the upper part of the island were furnished with a draw, or else played small part in the calculations of the average citizen. But a tunnel means a permanent dry land physical link, and the effect of such links upon the city's life is likely to be far reaching and beneficial.

The Statue of Frederick the Great.

It was a pertinent question that was asked on March 9 in the Senate by Mr. BACON of Georgia. He inquired whether the proposed appropriation of $15,000 "for absolutely necessary expenses" of the War College included an item for the cost of erecting a pedestal and dedicating a statue of FREDERICK the Great. Senator PROCTOR, who had charge of the bill, replied in the negative, but he did not deny that the statue offered by Emperor WILLIAM II. had been accepted by President ROOSEVELT, and that its erection in the grounds of the War College was contemplated by the Executive. Thereupon both Senator BACON and Senator TELLER pointed out that Congress had never sanctioned the erection of the statue, and that while a President might possibly have the right to accept provisionally such a gift in the name of the American people, such acceptance should be solely for the purpose of bringing the matter before Congress.

Mr. ROOSEVELT ought to know that the acceptance of the statue of FREDERICK the Great would not meet with the approval of the American people, and therefore ought not to be ratified by the Federal Legislature. At the time when an intimation of Emperor WILLIAM'S intention was conveyed to the State Department the ground on which the gift was to be made was scrutinized by the American press, and was shown to be utterly illusory. We were told on the highest authority that the purpose of erecting a statue of FREDERICK the Great in Washington—where a statue of Gen. ROCHAMBEAU had just been dedicated—was to commemorate the sympathy expressed and the services rendered by the Prussian sovereign to the United States during their struggle for independence. About the services rendered by ROCHAMBEAU there had never been any dispute: there is not a schoolboy in the country that cannot name them in detail. On the other hand, as to the alleged services of FREDERICK the Great, there was universal ignorance on this side of the Atlantic, and to requests for information no satisfactory answer was vouchsafed.

It was, indeed, pretended that during the Revolutionary War a sword bearing a complimentary inscription was presented to WASHINGTON by FREDERICK the Great. Had such an incident occurred, it is obvious that some record of it would have been made in the country of the donor. No such record exists in Germany. It is equally plain that had such a token of appreciation been received by the Commander of the Continental Army from the man then recognized as the greatest of European soldiers, the story would have been familiar to every man, woman and child in the United States. The proofs of the reception of the gift would have been innumerable and incontrovertible, and the sword itself would have been treasured in a national museum. As a matter of fact, searching inquiry has failed to unearth an atom of trustworthy evidence to support the legend of the sword. The tale is a myth.

It is true that FREDERICK the Great denounced some of the minor German princes for selling thirty-nine thousand of their subjects to GEORGE III. for service in the American colonies. It is also true that he refused to permit some of these mercenaries to traverse Prussian territory on their way to the port of embarkation. To FREDERICK, as an enlightened ruler and a patriot, such a transaction might well have seemed detestable. As a matter of fact, however, in wars to which he himself had been a party he had never scrupled to buy and shed the blood of mercenaries; and it might have been hard for him to show why a practice which was venial on the part of a King of Prussia was reprehensible in the case of an Elector of Hanover. The truth is that FREDERICK the Great had not forgiven GEORGE III. for dismissing WILLIAM PITT from the post of Prime Minister and leaving Prussia in the lurch at the crisis of the Seven Years War. He hoped that his treacherous fellow sovereign would lose the American colonies, and he chuckled when he learned that General WASHINGTON was avenging him at Trenton and at Princeton.

That the scornful and derisive comments made from time to time by FREDERICK on the blunders of British Generals in America were prompted partly by sound military judgment and partly by hatred of GEORGE III., but not at all by sympathy for republican institutions, can be conclusively established. There was just one service which, had he chosen, he might have rendered the American colonies. He might have recognized their independence, as was done by other Continental Powers, after France had proclaimed such recognition and upheld it with fleets and armies. Over and over again did the agents of the Continental Congress in Europe seek to obtain the recognition of their country's independence at the Court of Berlin. While the war lasted they could never gain it. Only after the Peace of Versailles had been signed in 1783, and the independence of the Thirteen Colonies had been acknowledged by GEORGE III. himself, did the wily and cold-hearted Prussian sovereign consent to take a similar step. Recognition on his part was then superfluous. "Thank you for nothing," was the comment of our diplomatists at the time.

We have given an accurate statement of the debtor and creditor account between the United States and FREDERICK the Great. Where can an American patriot find in it any pretext for the erection of a statue to the Prussian sovereign?

Medals and Metaphysics.

An amendment to the Army Appropriation bill grants $12,000 for 3,000 medals of honor to be given by the Secretary of War, in the name of Congress, "to such officers, non-commissioned officers and privates as have most distinguished, or may hereafter most distinguish, themselves by gallantry in action."

The Hon. HENRY MOORE TELLER of Colorado asked this impertinent or malicious question:

"There is no discretion in the Secretary of War to grant a medal to some man who has distinguished himself otherwise than in battle?"

The joint resolution of Congress approved July 12, 1862, provided that medals might be issued to "non-commissioned officers and privates for exceptional gallantry in action or other soldier-like qualities." The act of Congress approved March 3, 1863, struck out the words "or other soldier-like qualities" and added the word "officers." Mr. TELLER was perfectly familiar with the act of 1863. He declined to hear it read. Nor did he need to be told by Mr. WARREN of Wyoming that "the medals can be issued only for exceptional gallantry in battle." Fully aware of the existing legislation on the subject of medals of honor, Mr. TELLER did not refrain from this innuendo at a famous medico-militarist, ÆSCULAPIUS-MARS:

"I have seen a medal, or at least I have seen the statement that a medal was issued by the Secretary of War within a few years to a distinguished officer, somewhat distinguished now because of his rapid elevation to the position he occupies, and one he expects to occupy, and I understand that when it was issued the officer had never been in action in his life; that he had never been under fire at all. But the remarkable statement is that for about a week, in some Indian campaign, he was daily in danger of being fired on. I had an idea that almost all soldiers in active warfare are in danger of being fired on. I do not know that it indicates any great moral or physical courage in a soldier that he continues to march with his associates when he is in danger of being fired on. Probably that was the safest place for him. He could not retire."

Mr. HOAR should read a little ARISTOTLE to Mr. TELLER, coach him in faculties and potentialities. Exceptional gallantry in action may be potential, latent, static, ready to leap out at the first opportunity. It is surprising that a mind as metaphysical as Mr. SPOONER'S should make this Philistine comment on Mr. TELLER'S regrettably obtuse propositions:

"And if a medal was granted to one under such circumstances, all would be entitled to it."

Not a bit of it. The medico-martialist, with his knowledge of anatomy and physiology, his clear understanding of all his vital parts, of all the avenues of ammunition to his outwards and inwards, is put to an exceptional test and displays exceptional gallantry in permitting himself to be where he might be fired on if there were anybody to fire on him. It is scarcely creditable to the intelligence of Mr. SPOONER and of Mr. TELLER that they are dull to this obvious fact.

He Doesn't Need Jiu-Jutsu.

Mr. ROOSEVELT'S further studies in the Japanese art of jiu-jutsu will be observed with universal interest.

But he really doesn't need to add this to his numerous accomplishments.

He already possesses a gift more useful to a Presidential candidate than jiu-jutsu, or even than the dignified art of ceremonious and honorable tea.

The Japanese art of yoi-meguriawase; that is to say, of gyoko, is his. He is an adept in it. Barbarians sometimes call it bull luck. A certain Corsican identified it for a time with Destiny.

In the course of Senator DEPEW'S able and patriotic speech on the Naval Appropriation bill he paused to contribute the following incident from out of the wealth of his personal experience:

"I remember being in the Executive Mansion at one time and in Mr. LINCOLN'S office when a telegram was handed to him which gave the information that a Brigadier-General, through foolishness of an extreme sort, had been captured down in Virginia. In his command was a long train of pack wagons and mules. Mr. LINCOLN read the despatch and then took up his pen and said: 'With this pen I can make a Brigadier-General in a minute, but I cannot replace those mules.'"

Thus at last an historic anecdote, of which variants have been related by many persons claiming to have been the recipient of LINCOLN'S brigadier-and-mule remark, is presented in authoritative form by the person to whom the remark was actually addressed.

As the tax upon bachelors in Madagascar has been a signal failure, the Government has removed the burden it imposed upon this unfortunate class. The results of this attempt to discriminate against an important element in society will interest all students of sociology.

It occurred to the Madagascar Government, about two years ago, that if a special tax were placed upon all native bachelors the public good would be served in two ways. The inflow into the public treasury would be considerable, and matrimony would be stimulated and the growth of population would be accelerated.

But the action of the authorities was based upon insufficient acquaintance with the Malagasy character. It appears that there are no voluntary bachelors in the country. No man fails to procure a wife if he can get one. The only men who were legally liable to pay the bachelor tax were the very poor or the infirm; neither could pay the tax and the women would not marry them.

The treasury was not filled, the population was not increased; and as the law was a dead letter it has just been repealed.

Another Instance.

We note with affairs reminiscent
The changes the decades have played;
The crust of society isn't
The kind that our mothers have made.

Modern Conditions.

Parent—And you want a new dolly?
Mabel—Yes; this one has had twelve divorces already.

THE CENTIPEDE AND THE EDAM CHEESE.

The Possibilities of a Roosevelt-Parker Race for the White House.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Referring to your editorial this morning, there is also the possibility that the "pee-pul" might, by pushing the Edam cheese, eventually crush out of existence the centipede. The difference in weight, however, is carefully noted: also the strength. TREMONT.

NEW YORK, March 9.

From the Johnstown Herald.

Judge Parker is a man of stable qualities. He is keen of intellect, resolute of character and with integrity unbending. Occupying, as he does, an office second only in exaltation and in the distinction it confers, to the Presidency itself, he of all men offends none of the proprieties in aspiring to the Democratic nomination in the Democratic year of 1904.

Nevertheless, we believe friends of Judge Parker are making a serious mistake in seeking to secure for him an instructed delegation from this State. Instructed delegations are not the rule of New York State—not on the Democratic side of the house—although they have been occasionally resorted to. Let us revert to one or two that will easily be recalled by the youngest of us.

In 1880 the Democratic convention in session at Syracuse instructed the delegates for Samuel J. Tilden. Mr. Tilden was at that time the most eminent, as he was the most conspicuous, Democrat in America. He had been only four years before the choice of the people for President, but was robbed of the office by Republican dishonesty in the manipulation of Southern returning boards. The good faith of the party seemed, therefore, pledged to his renomination. But the New York instructions did not prevent his rejection by the national convention, notwithstanding his commanding position in the party and in the country. Mr. Tilden was set aside and the nomination went to Winfield Scott Hancock.

In 1892 the State convention met in Albany, and the delegation was instructed for David B. Hill. The instructions were voted unanimously, so complete was Mr. Hill's mastery of the situation in this State. Yet Mr. Hill was not nominated; indeed, his highest vote was only 114, while his successful competitor—a New Yorker, who was not mentioned in the New York convention—received 617.

While it is true that history cannot repeat itself this year in the personnel of the nominee, Mr. Cleveland having taken himself out of the list of candidates, there is at least a fine opening for it to do so in the convention defeat of the "instructed" candidate.

We have seen that New York instructions do not ensure victory. We have also seen that they are sometimes the precursors of defeat. May it not then be wise to take counsel of the logic of events before rushing headlong upon a course which others have followed to their overthrow?

In the battle of the ballots, as in the war of bullet and shell, it is the wise strategy board that measures all the probabilities and tests all the possibilities.

This much at least may be said without reflecting in the slightest degree upon Judge Parker's claims upon his party or his eminent fitness for the high office to which he aspires.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In that spirit of fairness which so thoroughly characterizes THE SUN, will you kindly inform your readers upon what ground you make the assertion that Judge Parker is "David B. Hill's candidate"?

Of course, we all know that Hill is supporting Parker's candidacy, but when THE SUN speaks of Judge Parker as being "Hill's candidate," the implication is that Parker is Hill's personal choice, rather than that of the Democratic voters of the State.

Now, is it not a notorious fact that the Democrats of this State were unanimous in their desire to have Judge Parker as their candidate for Governor in 1902?

Is it not also an equally well established fact that but for David B. Hill's fear that Judge Parker's election as Governor would inevitably have made him his party's candidate for President, the Judge would have received the nomination?

In view of these facts and also of the further fact that for the last few months Democrats in this State and all over the country have been turning to Judge Parker as the man who can unite his party and surely carry New York, how can THE SUN, with any semblance of truth, designate him as "Hill's candidate"? Why any more than Cleveland should be styled "Murphy's candidate"?

Pat McCarren is not supposed to be especially in love with Hill, yet McCarren is a strong Parker man. No one can accuse Smith M. Weed of being a Hill man, yet he stands ready to support Judge Parker loyally and enthusiastically.

Because Hill finds it to his political advantage to get on board the Parker band wagon, is it fair that Judge Parker should be made to suffer thereby?

Judge Parker may offer some weak points as a candidate, and if THE SUN can discover any of these upon which he can be effectively and legitimately attacked, it is, of course, privileged to give them to its readers. But in endeavoring to discredit Judge Parker on the ground that he is "David B. Hill's candidate" it appears to me that THE SUN is not living up to its reputation for fairness and truth. E. H. S.

NEW YORK, March 9.

Prisoners' Aid Societies in England.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your recent quotation from an article by an ex-prisoner in the *Nineteenth Century* magazine concerning prisoners' aid societies in England is calculated to convey a wrong impression as to the value of these associations. It is indeed a fact that the professional criminal and the old rounder have little use for such societies, especially when they insist that the ex-prisoner shall be industrious and earn an honest living. This ex-prisoner goes so far in his bitter exaggeration as to say that he has never been able to trace the fact of these societies in England having rendered efficient aid to any discharged prisoner.

As reliable testimony on this subject, I refer to the official report of the Commissioners of Prisons of England for 1903, made to both houses of Parliament and printed as a public document. This report shows that no less than 34,620 prisoners were offered assistance in some shape or other during the year. It testifies to the admirable work done by the Church Army through its missions and labor homes, and to the invaluable aid received from Colin Campbell, who directs this branch of the work. "So far as prisons are concerned," it says, "the Church Army has grown by steady and cautious development into one of the great reclaiming influences of the age." The zeal and desire to help shown by the authorities of the Salvation Army are also recognized, and special mention is made of "the reforming influences on prison life" exercised by "the admirable Association of Lady Visitors of Prisons, founded by Adeline, Duchess of Bedford, under the authority of the Commissioners and with the approval of the Secretary of State."

I may add that Edward Grubb, secretary of the Howard Association of England, is now in this country inspecting prisons and prison systems. The object of that association, for many years under the secretaryship of William Tallock, is not merely to benefit individual prisoners, but to improve the prison system of Great Britain. The individual prisoner as well as society is always benefited by any improvement of the prison system as a whole. S. J. BARROWS, Corresponding Secretary of the Prison Association of New York.

NEW YORK, March 8.

The Japs' English Pilot.

From the London Globe.

The first foreign adviser whom the Japanese ever employed was one Will Adams, an Englishman, who in 1600 was cast ashore in a storm while piloting a Dutch fleet.—"Japan in Transition."

Old Will Adams, in Yellow seas,
Running some Dutchmen before the breeze,
Caught by a squall that whipt the decks
And strawed the tide with a mile o' wrecks,
Was tossed ashore where the chopsticks grow,
Over three hundred years ago.

And when the people restored his life,
He would fain go home to his English wife;
But, "We will provide thee a score!" said they,
"Build thee a palace and gardens; stay,
"And teach us the English tricks you know!"
More than three hundred years ago.

Well, pilgrims visit his shrine to-day,
And schoolboys honor his name at play,
For his was the soul that first began
The English Lesson in old Japan;
And what Will taught them, those years ago,
You must ask the Bear if you want to know.

OUR NEAREST ISLAND.

The Debated Question as to the True Measure of Porto Rico's Prosperity.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your correspondent "Corresponsal" says, in THE SUN of March 7, that Porto Rico is not prospering under American administration, in spite of the fact that American exports to the island in 1903 were $11,819,895, against an average of about $4,000,000 a year for the last five years of Spanish control, and also in spite of the fact that Porto Rican sales to the United States in 1903 were $10,152,923, against an average of $2,600,000 yearly for the five years named. If selling more to and buying more from one customer is not prosperity, it certainly is an evidence that more business is being transacted, and more business in the one channel must mean more profit, by the saving of expense, than the same amount transacted in many channels.

But, says "Corresponsal," "the total commerce of the island is considerably less than it was before the war." Unfortunately for his case, "Corresponsal" does not offer any proof of this assertion. He merely states that the total exports of the island were $14,000,000 in 1903, against the "average for five years before the war, $17,000,000." This is another assertion without proof. What official figures give that $17,000,000? Again "Corresponsal" says: Imports for 1903, $14,000,000, against $17,500,000 average yearly for the last five Spanish years. Again proof is wanting of this assertion, and no official record is quoted. Even on his own showing Porto Rico came out even in 1903 on its foreign commerce, while for the last five Spanish years it went behind $500,000 a year, or $2,500,000 loss for the five years.

The exact figures of Porto Rico's foreign commerce for 1903 calendar year, as recorded and published by the Department of Commerce and Labor, through its reliable Bureau of Statistics, are as follows:

SALES.

United States, domestic goods	$9,986,782
United States, foreign goods	166,141
Other countries, domestic goods	4,267,910
Other countries, foreign goods	127,932
United States, gold and silver coin	6,533
Total sales	$14,555,298

"Corresponsal" ignored the odd $555,298—that amount means as much to Porto Rico, as does (on the basis of population alone) eighty times the amount to the United States.

PURCHASES.

United States, domestic goods	$11,424,313
United States, foreign goods	395,582
Other countries	2,119,523
Total purchases	$13,939,418

Net results of year's commerce:

Sales	$14,555,298
Purchases	13,939,418
Excess of sales over purchases	$615,880

If a yearly gain of $615,000, instead of a yearly loss of $500,000, making a real gain for the year of $1,115,000, does not mean that Porto Rico is prospering in its foreign commerce under American occupation, what result in figures will spell prosperity? Surely even "Corresponsal," pessimist though he may be, will not contend that his admitted yearly loss in trade of $500,000 added to or insured the prosperity of Porto Rico. Loss is not gain. Loss is loss, and the continued loss admitted by "Corresponsal" means one thing, and one thing only—eventual bankruptcy. From that threatened disaster American occupation has saved Porto Rico. Even "Corresponsal" admits that our "free market for Porto Rican sugar" has been of benefit to the island. It is also so, proportionally, in regard to the other domestic products sent to the mainland. Who can estimate what free access to our gigantic market means to Porto Rico for the future, in money and prestige? It enhances the value of every foot of land in the island. The foreign commerce gain of $1,115,000 in 1903, compared with Spanish years, is equal to considerably more than $1 per head for every man, woman, and child in the "tight little island."

"Corresponsal" speaks of "actual existing industrial distress." The following is from a recent letter of the highest authority in the island, Governor Hunt, who has been there six years:

"The coffee crop is almost normal this year, and the price considerably better than it has been for several years. Conditions in the island are as satisfactory as could be expected, and there is decided and steady progress in education, agriculture, commerce, and in all other ways in which we have a right to expect forward movements. While people are saying there is starvation in the main island, planters cannot harvest their crops or grow as extensive ones as they wish in adjacent islands (under the jurisdiction of Porto Rico) only twenty-five or thirty miles away. Until the lesson is better learned that the only way for a country to prosper is by the labor of its people we will have difficulties here. The New York and Porto Rico Steamship Company has chartered another vessel and instead of there being a 'picture of want' there is more activity than anywhere in the tropics that I know of."

The case in favor of American occupation of Porto Rico can safely rest on the foregoing figures and Governor Hunt's unimpeachable testimony. WALTER J. BALLARD.

SCHENECTADY, March 8.

THE RELIGION OF MRS. EDDY.

Commendation of an Attempt at Judicial Treatment of Christian Science.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your interesting and far-sighted editorial headed "The Religions of Two Women," in this morning's SUN, expresses the true spirit of impartial modern journalism. The tendency of the times seems toward a higher and more practical form of religion, capable of meeting both the spiritual and temporal needs of man. This tendency is coincident with a growing reaction against the dead rites and impotent dogmas of man-made religions.

The present opportunities for liberal education are quickening the human intelligence, and man is fast assuming the responsibility of working out his own salvation. One of the chief reasons that Christian Science has achieved the success referred to in your columns is that it furnishes a practical explanation of the otherwise hidden mysteries of godliness, and unlocks the Holy Scriptures, throwing on the pages of this heretofore sealed book the sunlight of revelation.

A religion that bears fruit in the lives of its adherents is one which the world preeminently needs. If it can be said of the Christian Scientist that he is a reliable business man, a good husband, and a public-spirited citizen, then the country owes to the tenets of his religion some thanks for the benefits he has conferred upon the community. In this twentieth century, the vast increase of population of the globe is emphasizing the urgent need of universal brotherhood and a better understanding of how to develop the latent resources of the earth through national and international cooperation. Commercial relations have probably done more to bring this into effect in recent years than has either religion or education. We believe, however, that if the lives of Christian Scientists embody the teachings and example of their leader, the Rev. Mary Baker G. Eddy, this much desired consummation will be gradually approximated, and an impulse will be given to the cause of Christianity such as it has never before received since the commencement of the Christian era.

RICHARD P. VERRALL,
Christian Science Publication Committee.

NEW YORK, March 9.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* You say editorially to-day that "the growth of Christian Science is the most marvellous of modern religious phenomena."

It would not be so marvellous, perhaps, if the spiritual development of men had kept pace with their material and intellectual development. It is not marvellous to those who see in Christian Science, by practical experience, that a proper understanding of life reveals that the rational needs of men are satisfied by conduct in accordance with truth, and that no man who is destitute of material things and physical health properly apprehends the teachings of the Lord Christ. Christian Science shows a departure from ordinary orthodoxy in that it is not necessary to die to win the benefits of the life it inculcates.

Mrs. Eddy has unveiled an aspect of truth which seems too simple for a great many; yet, if regarded with honest mind, its benefits are far in excess of anything offered by any other scheme of spiritual instruction, and the criterion is present now, and has not to be awaited in another world.

In addition, Christian Science shows how much of the physical disease of to-day is due to the grisly terrors anticipated in a post-mortem state, a teaching springing out of the wickedness of men's hearts and the ignorance and ambition of priestcraft and sectaries.

"Science and Health," Mrs. Eddy's book, if read without prejudice, and under the strict scrutiny of private judgment (not swallowed entire and unquestioned), will do much to show that while the world is materially in the twentieth century, yet spiritually it is at about 945 A. D.

If its positive teaching as to affirmative good is accepted, and used, the results will appear in a fuller, stronger, richer life to-day. Evil, it says, is created by us, but good exists from God forever, and as we follow His laws and leave our evil, evil leaves us.

It is necessary to go to this book, however, not in a morbid state of mind, as to some ghostly confessor, but in as normal a condition of thought as one drinks in the beauty of the stars and the sea.

NEW YORK, March 9. PANTHEIRA.

MIKADO OR CZAR?

Judge Pryor Writes of the Old Friendship of This Nation for Russia.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It cannot be amiss at the present moment to recall the commencement of that uniform friendship which has characterized the relations of Russia and the United States.

In 1806 President Jefferson, answering a letter from the Czar Alexander, invoked his powerful influence in favor of the rights of neutrals, so shamefully violated by both belligerents in the then pending war. As we know, the appeal of the President was not without effect on the mind of the monarch, and their correspondence revealed the reciprocal regard and admiration of these eminent rulers.

From that day to the present moment the policies of the two Governments have evinced for each other the confidence and cordiality of an unavowed alliance.

It is true that on the outbreak of the Crimean War the sympathies of the American people appeared to be on the side of the allies; but that sentiment was speedily reversed, and in the end the British Minister was given his passports.

The undersigned, then an editor of the *Washington Union*, the organ of the Pierce Administration, published a pro-Russian article in that paper which provoked an outburst of criticism and condemnation throughout the country. The writer severed his connection with the *Union*, and through the *National Intelligencer* effectually replied to his adversaries. On the revulsion of the popular feeling he was recalled from his retirement in Virginia and sent as special commissioner to Greece. With that country the United States Government was conducting a controversy which diplomacy had failed to accommodate. But with the assistance of the Russian influence, then ascendant in the kingdom of Greece, the commissioner was enabled, in less than a month, to adjust the difficulty which otherwise would inevitably have precipitated a rupture.

From experience I venture to predict that in no great while the American people will cease to be the patrons of Japan and will revert to their hereditary policy of friendship for Russia. ROGER A. PRYOR.

NEW YORK, March 10.

A PROFOUND DISCUSSION.

Argument That the Slouch Hat Ought to to Be Worn With Men's Evening Dress.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* My daughter tells me that I must buy a crush hat; that it's something dreadful for me to wear, as I habitually do, a soft hat with evening clothes.

Now, I have not only the greatest admiration for my daughter, but I have also the greatest respect for her judgments, which, commonly, I find to be good and true. But I think she is wrong when she says that a soft hat is out of place with evening clothes; to me the soft hat has aways seemed more than permissible in that conjunction, it has always seemed perfectly suitable and appropriate, and to be, in fact, a more graceful adjunct of the apparel of one so attired than a hat whose form presented rigid outlines.

Evening clothes, while constituting what is commonly called conventional attire, are really designed for the greater ease and comfort and general satisfaction of the wearer, and they should communicate to him nothing of hardness and rigidity, but something of ease and smoothness and grace; and why a man in such clothes should wear on his head a hat like a section of stovepipe I do not understand. True, if a man is going to carry his hat about with him indoors, a crush hat is more desirable than a soft hat; but that, it seems to me, has nothing to do with the question as to whether a soft hat may appropriately be worn with evening clothes; and, as I have said, it seems to me not only appropriate, but most suitable, and really, with its softness, and its sweep and grace of outlines, to be the hat most in harmony with such dress, and so the one best calculated to contribute to the completely graceful apparelling of the wearer.

Now, I hope it will not be considered by any one that the soft hat in this use appeals to me in any way on account of its informality; any real informality in evening attire would be something that I should greatly deplore. A derby hat, for instance, worn with evening clothes would seem to me something far more dreadful than a soft hat so worn might seem to some. Really, if I were to meet in an elevated car, say, a man in evening dress and a derby hat, I think I should have to go into the next car to escape the sight.

On the other hand, a straw hat worn by a man in evening dress in summer would seem not at all disturbing. It might, indeed, seem just a shade outré, and yet it would not be inappropriate, but really a hat suitable to wear at that season with cool, unencumbering garments of the character of evening clothes; in keeping with them in comfort.

But my main contention is that the soft hat is one entirely appropriate and suitable to be worn with evening clothes, and the one likely to be the most becoming, and so the most suitable for most wearers. Perhaps somebody of profounder knowledge, of greater wisdom, or of better taste than I will have the kindness to tell me if I am wrong.

NEW YORK, March 9. AMICUS.

The Salt Water System in Boston.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I notice in your paper of March 8 a letter signed "Aqua Fresca" in regard to salt water service for fires. He mentions several cities which he says do not use salt water, but fresh, and adds that there are no salt water mains for fire service in this country. Now, Boston has had for several years a real salt water system in a section of the city, but it has never been used at a fire, although exhibition tests have been given several times, which of course were arranged and planned beforehand. I think I have been a close student of the fire department here, but I cannot find out why this system has not been used at a fire (for there has been plenty of opportunity), but I have an idea that it is because we have only one fireboat to do the pumping, and it would be dangerous to take her, for she might be wanted at some place on the waterfront at the same time.

The water here I believe is not kept in the pipes, but it is supposed they can be filled instantly by the fireboat and by electric connection at the hydrants; and in the tests of this system it has been shown that an additional water supply of this kind, with a permanent pumping station, would be a wonderful help at a large fire. I do not believe salt water can be kept in the pipes, for the same reasons which "Aqua Fresca" gives; and as for street purposes, everybody knows the injurious effect of salt on the streets.

I have been very much interested in all the accounts and letters in your paper in regard to the salt water service, and have expected before now to see some letter from Boston in regard to the system here. C. D. S.

BOSTON, March 10.

Jewish Intermarriage in Australia.

A Rabbi, lately of Sydney, in the London Jewish Chronicle.

Intermarriage is the great and burning question of Australian Judaism. Coghlan, the great statistician of New South Wales, shows that rather more than one in five Jewish married persons have married out of the pale. There are very few families in which some member—or often members—is not to be found married beyond the pale. A curious point in connection with this subject is that these intermarriages occur mostly among and between Jews and Roman Catholics.

I found it necessary to preach a crusade against this evil, returning to the charge in my pulpit almost week after week. I even went so far as to threaten to resign my office if something were not done to suppress the evil.

Intermarriage is due to social causes. There is much freer intercourse between Jew and non-Jew in Australia than in England, with the result that, as much more fraternal relations obtain there than here, intermarriages are more numerous. I do not think that there is any city where Jew and non-Jew live more harmoniously. These intermarriages are, as a rule, most unhappy in their results. It is not to be supposed that the Jews alone deplore these unions. They are as keenly regretted by all other sections, and the ecclesiastics of the Roman Church have been especially outspoken in declaring against them.

The Monticello Poet Appreciated in Boston Literary Circles.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* A new luminary has indeed appeared on your horizon. We, one of a circle of appreciative admirers at Boston, advert to Albert G. Rives, whose muse's birthplace claims the historic name of Monticello. Let us assure him that while his verse, rather Gilbertian in a way, is not of the school of Cowper and Hemans and other old worthies, it strikes us as very original, weirdly witty and altogether notable.

We hope to see more of it. W. R. W.

JAMAICA PLAINS, March 9.

Cigar With Every Shave.

From the London Daily Mail.

So keen is the competition among barbers in South London that a practitioner in Walworth road yesterday announced that in future he will shave for three halfpence and throw in the best two-penny cigar for nothing.