The Sun.

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 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.

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at No. 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.

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.

Qualifications for Vice-President.

They were set forth in crystalline clearness eight months ago by Senator FAIRBANKS of Indiana. The Senator was describing one who had been his ideal of statesmanship in high office. He said of that statesman:

"He was temperamentally fitted to occupy the great office to which he had been called by his countrymen.

"He possessed a dignity of character, a serenity and soundness of judgment which won the confidence of the nation.

"He always had the patience to hear, the wisdom and courage to decide.

"He was controlled by reason and not by passion.

"He had a veneration for the exalted traditions of the executive office, and he did great things in a great way.

"He carried into the office large experience and a full knowledge of public men.

"He sought to establish public confidence, knowing full well that it is the basis of industrial progress and national advancement.

"He endeavored to learn the will of the people and faithfully to interpret and carry it into the public law and public administration.

"He believed that that was the wisest statesmanship which sought to give true expression to the public purpose.

"He never did rash things.

"He was a conservative, not only in judgment and word, but in deed also.

"He was never violent in act or speech.

"He was familiar with the functions and limitations of the various departments of the Government; he knew their rights and prerogatives and did not seek to override them, but endeavored, so far as in him lay, to maintain them unimpaired.

"He led, not by force of artifice, but by force of the principles he espoused and by his own inherent virtue. He successfully led because the people had faith in the integrity and wisdom of the man and believed in the soundness of his policies.

"His manner was dignified, natural and graceful; his language sober and chaste, and his voice melodious and far reaching. He did not assume an air of superiority, nor did he speak for the purpose of self-exploitation, but because he had a message to convey to his countrymen."

Is the portrait recognized? Such were the qualifications for the Vice-Presidency as defined by Senator FAIRBANKS in his speech of Sept. 14, 1903, at the unveiling of the McKinley monument at Toledo, Ohio.

But, it may be said, McKINLEY was Mr. FAIRBANKS'S ideal of a President, not of a Vice-President; and he was describing the qualifications for President, not those for Vice-President.

Are they not the same? Should they not be the same? Does not the Vice-President sometimes become President?

The Remsen Bill.

In the Mayor's memorandum explaining why he approved the East River Gas bill he said:

"Before this measure came into my hands I shared the opinion of many persons that it was in some way contrary to public interests, but after hearing argument for and against it, and carefully examining its provisions, I am convinced that this opinion was unwarranted."

Does anybody doubt Mayor McCLELLAN'S word? Does anybody believe that if examination and the advice of the eminent legal experts whom he consulted had confirmed instead of removing his original prejudice against the bill, he would have hesitated an instant about withholding his approval?

Last night the chairman of the City Club's committee on legislation was quoted as saying:

"The committee examined the Remsen bill very carefully and came to the conclusion that there was nothing in it worth fighting. We decided that there was nothing of an objectionable nature in the measure sufficient to warrant our opposing it."

We submit that it is about time to deal out to the Mayor of this city a small installment of that American fair play to which his official station and his personal character entitle him.

An Attack Upon the Monroe Doctrine.

More than once of late we have heard the assertion made by men whose opinion on some subjects is respected, that these United States have outgrown the Monroe Doctrine, and that, in the interest of civilization, we should renounce it formally, and permit Europe to occupy and reclaim Latin America. Let us note what they say, and see whether it is convincing.

The latest advocate of a trenchant change in our attitude toward the Latin Americans is Prof. MUENSTERBERG of Harvard University. In his new book, "The Americans," he predicts that the time is near when the anachronism, and, consequently, the absurdity, of the Monroe Doctrine will be recognized. He maintains that the conditions no longer exist which caused the doctrine to be formulated. That is to say, there exists no longer a sharp contrast between Europe, dreaded as the seat of tyranny, and the United States, regarded as the home of democratic freedom. Americans know, the professor says, that Englishmen, Frenchmen and Italians are as free as themselves; that, in fact, all European countries except Russia and Turkey possess representative institutions; while, on the other hand, all the Latin-American republics, except Argentina and Chile, and perhaps we should add Mexico, are repulsive caricatures of liberty and democracy. The first of the original arguments, therefore, for the Monroe Doctrine has lost its basis. Americans should no longer feel themselves called upon to protect blackmailing Latin-American republics from invasion at the hands of self-governing European countries. The second of the original arguments for the doctrine has also, in Prof. MUENSTERBERG'S opinion, been shorn by time of its validity. The exclusion of the European colonial system from the New World is no longer essential to the maintenance of our own political safety. If, then, the United States shall continue to uphold a doctrine which now cannot be justified, we cannot escape the reproach of promoting bankruptcy and anarchy, and of hindering the progress of one of the richest continents.

There is just truth enough in Prof. MUENSTERBERG'S heterodox assertion to make it, at the first glance, plausible. It would be, as he says, ridiculous to compare the mockery of parliamentary institutions which is exhibited in Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador and the Central American republics with the systems of representative government the orderly working of which in Great Britain, France, Italy, Norway and Sweden may well be admired. It is also true that, if the whole of Latin America were to be partitioned to-morrow, as Africa was but yesterday, among European Powers, not one of those Powers, nor all of them put together, would seriously contemplate the overthrow of the independence of the United States. We will go further and admit the probability that the natural resources of Latin America would be turned to account more quickly and more fruitfully in the hands of Englishmen, Germans, Frenchmen or Italians than they seem likely to be in the hands of the present occupants.

It is, nevertheless, indispensable for us to continue to uphold the Monroe Doctrine. First, from motives of common humanity; and, secondly, from the viewpoint of our own national interests. Can Prof. MUENSTERBERG deliberately advocate a reversion to the state of things which existed in the eighteenth century, when the Caribbean was the cockpit of the British, French and Spanish? Must he not foresee, if he will suffer the past to interpret the future, that, if Latin America were partitioned among the European Powers, their respective allotments would always be looked upon thereafter as the prizes of intrigue and war? It is true enough, as we have said, that, economically and politically, the average Latin-American republic presents but a sorry spectacle, compared with the United States; but we must remember that it entered under grave disabilities on the experiment of self-government. The Monroe Doctrine, however, has at least assured to it the opportunity of trying to lift itself in the social scale by safeguarding it from foreign invasion and conquest. On the whole, for the last three-quarters of a century that doctrine has made for peace in Latin America, whereas partition would prove a sword.

As for our actual and prospective traffic with Latin America, experience should have taught us that from all that part of it which should fall into German, French or Italian hands our manufacturers and merchants would be barred. Then again, for strategic reasons too obvious to need emphasis, we, as owners of the Panama Canal, could not permit a European Power to occupy any part of the coasts of Central America, or of Colombia, Venezuela and Ecuador. We have no wish to see ourselves placed in a position where, for the defence of our transmarine possessions, if not of our own shores, we should have to tax ourselves to maintain an army as large as Germany's, and a navy as large as that of Great Britain.

The Monroe Doctrine was formulated not for a day, but for all time. The American people never will renounce it. Never will they suffer the New World to be made the victim of partition.

The Official Referee Measure.

The bill for the appointment of thirty official referees in New York and Brooklyn, to be known as Supreme Court Commissioners, whom the court must select to act in all cases of compulsory reference and proceedings to acquire land for public purposes, is probably unconstitutional.

In the second place, it will at once impose an additional burden of taxation to the amount of more than $300,000 a year upon the taxpayers of the Greater New York. Each commissioner is to receive a salary of $10,000 per annum and to have the right to appoint a stenographer and clerk at a salary of $1,500.

Again, the bill practically prohibits any lawyer outside the privileged class which it creates from ever having any business as referee, except by the consent of all the parties to a litigation, and from ever being appointed a commissioner in proceedings to condemn lands. It will thus operate as a writ of prohibition against the great body of practising lawyers in New York and Brooklyn, scores and hundreds of whom are just as well qualified to act as referees and commissioners as any persons who can possibly be appointed under the provisions of the bill.

Finally, there is no probability that the enactment of the measure will do away with the delays in the administration of the law which it is ostensibly designed to prevent. Litigants who are defeated will be just as eager to appeal from the judgments of these official referees and condemnation commissioners as they are to appeal from the judgments of non-official referees and commissioners under the existing system. It is extremely unlikely that thirty men, even if all are able and industrious, can do the work which has heretofore been done by many hundreds of lawyers in this community, whose labors are performed, not at the expense of the community at large, but at the cost of the suitors in each particular case. Only a short time will elapse before there will arise such an outcry of dissatisfaction on the part of attorneys and clients as will compel the Legislature to abolish this cumbrous scheme to give a lot of politicians in the legal profession judicial powers which would never be conferred upon them by the vote of the people.

We do not forget that the measure has the sanction of the Commission on the Law's Delays. But we remember also that it has been amended in some essentials since it left their hands so as to make it serviceable to the politicians. In Brooklyn, for example, non-residents may be appointed commissioners, and the Republican leaders have already suggested that half of them shall be chosen from counties in the Second Judicial Department other than Kings county. One of these nominees is JAMES G. GRAHAM, the Secretary to the Governor, who is a resident of Orange county. He is a good man, but what do the lawyers of Brooklyn, whether Republicans or Democrats, say to this?

We are informed that the number of applications for the thirty appointments which are possible under this bill already amounts to several hundred. In any event, scores of applicants must be disappointed to every one who receives a place. Every man who is rejected will be not only a victim of disappointment, but forever afterward a foe to the system which bars him from serving as a referee.

This barrier will have been created by a Republican Legislature with the sanction of a Republican Governor; and the many thousands of practising lawyers in the Greater New York are likely to see to it in the course of time—and not such a very long time either—that the Republican party shall suffer the consequences.

Progress in Jamaica.

Earlier conditions in the island have left an impression that Jamaica is a decadent and impoverished appendage of the British Empire. The recent annual report of the Governor, Sir A. W. L. HEMMING, indicates a more hopeful condition. It shows a fair measure of progress and notable increase in production and commerce.

Exports of insular produce and manufacture are given as $11,000,000, an increase of $2,000,000 over the preceding year. This sum, in its relation to the population of the island, places Jamaica about on a par with Porto Rico. The imports are given, exclusive of coin and bullion, as a little less than $10,000,000, an increase of nearly $1,500,000. The report shows that this increase in exports has been continuous for the last five years. Exports for 1897-98 appear as a little less than $7,000,000. The shipments of last year increase that by about 60 per cent.

The banana trade, largely with the United States, stands as one of the chief industries, and the last five years show that within that time this industry has increased two and one-half times. The trade in sugar and rum stands next to the fruit trade in its amount and importance, though falling a long way below. It amounts to only about one-quarter of the banana trade. This represented a little more than $1,500,000, an increase of about $300,000 over the preceding year.

It is quite probable that a time will come when the Jamaican banana industry will suffer through Cuban competition. Nipe Bay is a long run nearer American ports than is Jamaica, and its vicinity might well supply us with a considerable part of our present importation of $8,500,000 worth of bananas. Meanwhile the United States rather than England is responsible for this gratifying improvement in Jamaican conditions.

The Bible, Its Critics and Its Defenders.

Next week there is to be held in New York the first convention of the American Bible League, an association incorporated last October for the defence of the Bible against the destructive "higher criticism" now so rife throughout Christendom. The conference which led to the organization of the league was called last May by a committee at the head of which was Dr. FRANCIS L. PATTON, the distinguished President of the Princeton Theological Seminary, and he will be chief among the speakers at next week's convention.

This league was formed for the purpose of combining "leading Christians of the various denominations who believe in the full inspiration and supreme authority of the Bible as the Word of GOD," under the conviction that "in crises like the present" it is their "imperative duty" to organize for the defence of their faith against its now numerous and powerful enemies. A list of "prospective members" of the league sent to us includes about one thousand names, and in it we observe are many professors and other officers of theological seminaries of the different "evangelical" Churches.

In speaking of the present situation in Christendom regarding the Bible as a "crisis" this league does not exaggerate its importance. The authority of the Scriptures and even their genuineness are in question. The Bible is criticized on its merits and no longer is accepted as a revelation and an inspiration from GOD, but is put in the same general category with other ancient literatures or other expressions of human genius. The attributed authorship of books of the Bible is denied or disputed. The Pentateuch, for example, is treated as a collection of legends and traditions and documents of unknown authorship, put together, more or less clumsily, by an unknown editor who lived centuries after MOSES and gave his name as the author, by a sort of pious fraud, with a view to creating a superstitious veneration for them. Contradictions, inconsistencies and frauds are alleged.

The same spirit and method of criticism are adopted with reference to the Gospels. These are described as compilations from lost originals edited for the purpose of sustaining religious and theological theories and doctrines of a time long subsequent to that of JESUS. The miracles of both the Old and the New Testament are denied as narratives of possible facts. The Virgin birth of JESUS is cast aside as not even sustained by the Gospel narratives themselves, and even the very existence of JESUS as a historical character is disputed.

A tract issued by the Bible League is justified, therefore, in declaring that "the 'higher criticism,' if universally accepted, would paralyze all Christian missions, empty all our churches, silence all our pulpits and give every man permission to believe and act according to his liking." That is, it leaves Christianity no authority on which to rest as a religion, but reduces it to a disputable system of moral philosophy; eliminates the supernaturalism which is essential to a religion.

If this subversive and destructive criticism was confined to avowed opponents of religion and the Church, as it was formerly, it might not be an enemy dangerous enough to require the formation of a Christian league against it; but now it has affected profoundly the thought and radically changed the view of a large part of Christendom itself. It has entered into theological seminaries to a very great extent, and is influencing the sentiment and modifying the points of view in many pulpits of even the most nominally orthodox Churches. We see traces of its influence in great numbers of the papers of clerical authorship in magazines and reviews devoted to religious discussion, and frequently its acceptance is frankly avowed and boldly defended in them. A whole school of religious thought, called the "New Theology," has been built up around it, and in this school is included a very considerable part of the most cultivated intellect of the clergy of this time.

Accordingly, this Bible League may well call imperative the present need for organization in defence of the old view of the Bible. Its president has good reason for saying that there has arisen an irrepressible and irreconcilable conflict between those who believe in the Bible as the inspired Word of GOD and those who look on it as simply a human and fallible production, without final authority and with obvious defects and contradictions insulting to the human reason.

The convention next week, accordingly, will be of pivotal importance. To quote again from the president of the Bible League, the time has come when "the issues at stake must be clearly stated and sharply defined, in order that the people of GOD may be enabled to judge for themselves as to the merits and demerits of the two schools of thought." As another of the members puts it, this controversy involves "a matter of life and death for evangelical truth and life." But in order to vanquish the school of destructive criticism, with its imposing array of scholarship, there will have to be marshalled against it a more potent force of evidence satisfactory to the judgment of this period of radical religious inquiry.

An Early Peace?

Dealing with the possibility of an early peace in the Far East, the London *Investors' Review* points out that a great deal lies in the hands of the leading international financiers, and that it is to their interest to stop the conflict, which promises no permanent advantage to Russia even should she ultimately triumph, and threatens the stability of both Russian and Japanese national finance should it be prolonged. The *Investors' Review* states in connection with the subject that it has reason to believe that Japan still refrains from advancing any undue pretensions, and that with Corea secured from Russian dominance, with Port Arthur dismantled and converted into a free port, a durable peace might be arranged. The opening of Manchuria to the commerce of the world would satisfy neutral nations, and remove the risk of trouble with the native races by promoting the commercial and industrial development of the country.

The dangers likely to arise from a prolongation of the war, or the overwhelming victory of one side or the other, are forcibly presented. A serious Russian reverse on land might, the *Review* says, bring on a panic on the Paris Bourse that it would not be in the power of the great financial houses to smother; while a great Japanese disaster would land the English market in difficulties of a grave character. It therefore invites action on the part of the financiers to bring the conflict to a speedy conclusion, in order that the perils already looming on the political horizon as a consequence of it may be averted.

The difficulty at present lies in the one-sidedness that has hitherto characterized the war, the reverses suffered by their navy having deeply stirred the whole Russian people.

It began with the constructive recess and it ends with the snap adjournment.

Whether the court decides that Mrs. MARY BASS of Louisville, Ky., was guilty of an unjustifiable assault in emptying a pail of water on Mrs. EMILY SMITH of Hazlewood, or holds her to have acted within her rights, public sympathy will be hers. As the original of the popular Mrs. WIGGS she was held up to the public as a most deserving but poor and unfortunate woman. Since she became famous her home has been overrun by persons from all parts of the country, some animated by a desire to aid so worthy a woman, others merely anxious to look at her, as they might at the sacred white elephant or a new giant. The peaceful life she had led vanished when she was immortalized in print, and now she complains that "life has been made miserable" by the importunities of those who wish to gaze upon her. Mrs. BASS's assault upon Mrs. SMITH is not denied, according to the despatches. She only defended her right to be left alone, perhaps more vigorously than politely. In doing that she deserves the sympathy of a very large fraction of the public, who will hope to see her honorably discharged in court.

The Republican leaders of the House may have several reasons for acquiescing in Mr. ROOSEVELT's desire for an April adjournment of Congress.

One of the reasons may be found right on the surface in the general willingness to escape the parliamentary attentions of the Hon. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS before warm weather sets in.

He Despises Algebra and Euclid.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I was appalled the other day to find that algebra is taught to little children in the public schools of this city; which is a real cruelty to the child—besides being a waste of time.

I once learned and passed an examination in the four first books of Euclid, and can take my affidavit they never did me five cents' worth of good—materially or intellectually. E. H. J.

NEW YORK, April 27.

April Showers.

Now April showers
That bring May flowers,
Or used to bring them, don't you know,
Are just as like
To go on strike,
And bring instead a nice June snow.

W. J. L.

AMERICA AND RUSSIA.

Michael Davitt Replies Again, and the Discussion Is Closed.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* This letter will, necessarily, be my last in reply to your various correspondents, as I must sail for Europe in a few hours. But neither "An American," Mr. W. G. Fisher, nor "Another American" advances a single fact or rational argument against my previous contentions that demands a reasoned answer from me. They offer your readers a liberal abuse of my "ignorance and intolerance." This, together with an equally liberal allowance of knowledge and virtue given to themselves, is about the worth and character of their letters.

"An American's" conclusions in this respect remind me of the famous reply of the London cockney to the question, "What have you to urge against Home Rule?" "My hobjection to 'Ome Rule," answered the enlightened Briton, "is the hignorance of the Hirish!"

"An American" gives us a glowing account of his family history (which has, of course, a profound bearing upon the merits of the Far Eastern question), but he still denies us the magic talisman of his name. Where he makes an effort to return to what was the origin of this controversy, your correspondent puts his case in this sentence and sentiment: "A brutal Power like Russia in her contest with a brave, alert little nation only a fraction of her size, which she tried to rob and oppress, and then to intimidate." And, according to "An American," not alone all Americans, but "a large majority" of Irish-Americans hold these views. He, again, omits to mention a single name.

It was an editorial reference in THE SUN to a similar sentiment to this, as voiced in an article in the London *Times*, which induced me to write you my first letter as a comment upon, not alone the want of truth in this wholesale accusation against Russia, but the blatant hypocrisy of such language in the mouth of the leading English paper within three years of the ending of England's brigand and brutal war against the Boer republics. Your correspondents came to the rescue of the position I thus assailed, justified this English view, as being that of "all Americans," likewise, and hence my "hignorance" in disputing the fairness of this opinion or the claim thus made as to its universal prevalence in this country.

Now, allow me to deal with definite accusations against Russia, as made in England and repeated by your correspondents, and others, over here:

1. "Russia is a brutal bully." This is matter of opinion. But, so is England. She has been brutal in Ireland, in India, in South Africa and elsewhere, without evoking the indignation of your correspondents. There are 350,000,000 of people in Europe, outside of Great Britain, who live much nearer to Russia than the citizens of this republic do, and at least 90 per cent. of them believe the Russians to be less brutal, more truthful, more Christian and more honorable, both as a nation and as a race, than the people and nation of Great Britain.

2. "Japan is a brave little nation." This, again, is matter of opinion. I have not disputed their claim to courage.

3. "Russia is fighting a nation only a fraction of her size which she tried to rob and oppress." Let us look at the facts: Japan has a population of forty millions of people. Russia has one hundred and forty millions. This gives Russia three and a half to one. But Japan has her forty millions quite close to the theatre of the war, while the centre of Russia's power is six thousand miles away. The disparity in available active forces tells, therefore, for the present, against Russia. Ultimately, no doubt, it will weigh against Japan.

This is "An American's" strong point against Russia.

But, the Boer republics were "a brave, alert little nation." Their joint populations numbered less than four hundred thousand people, counting men, women and children. The British Empire, boasting three hundred millions of subjects, made a wanton war upon a nation of less than half a million, eighty times less numerous than the Japs. The Boers, too, were a white race; but, neither this fact nor their weakness in numbers appealed to the consideration of England. Their homes were burned, their wives and children were imprisoned in concentration camps, and the country which now unites with your correspondents in attacking Russian brutality committed acts of cowardly inhumanity in South Africa which no historian or critic has ever brought against Russia's record in any war with any white race.

I did not say, as your correspondents allege, that "popular feeling in America was on the side of Russia." What I did say was that, in my belief, based on the result of recent journeys over large sections of this country, "genuine Americans were not the enemies of Russia in this conflict." I hold to that view still, and for these additional reasons:

1. Russia has never, directly or indirectly, done a wrong or an unfriendly act to this republic. On the contrary, she did, despite the silly denial of one of your correspondents, offer assistance to this country at the time of the civil war, when England was perfidiously trying to secure its disruption. She also disposed of Alaska to you, as an undoubtedly friendly act, and not for any other consideration. These are historic facts, and no amount of pro-British contradiction can weaken their force or accuracy.

2. Japan, on the contrary, has nothing to her credit as a friend of this country. She is, notoriously, the most immoral nation claiming to be civilized. The Chinese are paragons of veracity and honesty compared to their yellow kindred in the neighboring Island Empire.

3. In this war Japan was the first assailant. It was she, and not Russia, which forced on the war.

4. If Manchuria is, as part of China, the bone of contention between the two belligerants, Russia has been there by the consent of China, in virtue of services rendered to the Chinese Empire in saving her, first, from England and, next, from Japan, when these present allies made war upon the Celestial rulers of Manchuria.

5. And Russia has at least as good a right to remain in Manchuria as England has to hold Egypt, or America has to domineer over the Philippines.

These are facts and circumstances which ought to influence the formation and trend of opinion if such opinion is to have a basis of reason or fair play for its existence or expression. And it is because I believe real, and not anonymous, "Americans" to be influenced by reason and a sense of justice in their judgments that I refuse to accept the contentions of your correspondents that American opinion is formed, as theirs is, on prejudice and on the latest calumnies sent out from London against the Russians.

I thank you for the hospitality of your columns. I am off to a land where THE SUN (that of New York as well as the heavenly luminary) occasionally shines; to a country in which Americans of the type and political faith of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln are honored and respected more than in any other land on earth; but where we believe the flabby Anglo-American, of the same kidney as your correspondents, to be but a modern and a miserable caricature of genuine Americanism. Japan is welcome to the sympathy of "Americans" who borrow both their principles and religion from London; the "Jingoes" of your population who think a thousand times more of an American girl who becomes an English Duchess (in exchange for her fortune) than of a thousand American ladies who only become the wives of American gentlemen. Of this type of degenerate "American" your anonymous correspondents are faithful exemplars. They take their views and opinions on all European questions from the London despatches in their morning papers, just as their brother "Americans," the dudes of Fifth avenue, borrow the cut of their cravats and the lie of their pants from the latest patterns of Piccadilly. Europe knows well how to discriminate between the real and the sham American, and three hundred and fifty millions of European people know that twelve or fifteen millions of pro-British citizens inside your big republic are not the eighty millions who make up the mighty nation which England tried and failed three times to strangle—when you were young and weak. Au revoir.

Yours gratefully, MICHAEL DAVITT.

NEW YORK, April 26.

Sunflowers and Love.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* A "Matter of Fact" letter in your paper of this date leaves me in doubt whether its author is criticising Moore's theory about true love or his theory about the sunflowers. If Mr. "Matter-of-Fact" will pay me a visit at my country home, where I have sunflowers that are not shaded at any hour of the day, I think I can correct his notion about them. As to the other part of the "exquisite song," every one is entitled to his own idea about the permanence of love. But a man who can't really see a sunflower, in the course of "many a summer" of "close observation" is perhaps, scarcely a safe guide in regard to the more delicate flowers of the heart. S. B. M.

NEW HAVEN, Conn., April 26.

Example of Feminization.

Mr. Mann—Yes, Maria, women teachers will feminize a boy; take Johnny, for instance. What? He set the house afire, tried to scalp his little brother, and killed the cat? My son, come with me!

A Sneak.

First Frog—So you think Croaker is shifty?

Second Frog—Yes, he borrowed my new mushroom umbrella and returned a toadstool!

FRANKLIN PIERCE AND ALTON B. PARKER.

Comments From an Old Republican Who Wants Stability at Washington.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Whether it be a distinction without a difference or a difference with a distinction contained in the observations of "Democrat," in THE SUN of April 22, on the availability of Judge Parker considered as a Democratic nominee for the Presidency, a conspicuous error occurs in interesting particulars. If, in the language of our Governor-Chairman, your correspondent "drew his own deductions" from what he gleaned from books more pleasing to the vanity of their authors than instructive to readers, he was certainly misinformed; if, on the other hand, he relied upon personal recollections, the flight of time has made havoc with his memory as regards the standing of Franklin Pierce before his countrymen. He observes, for example: "One of the most splendid victories ever gained by the Democracy before the civil war was achieved in 1852 by Franklin Pierce, of whom at the beginning of the campaign scarcely any one beyond the boundaries of the Granite State had even heard." Again, he says: "What really gave the Democratic nominee his phenomenal majority was, first, a violent popular recoil from the importunate, meddlesome, domineering disposition of the Whig competitor; secondly, the healing of the Barnburner schism which had rent the party in New York four years before." Much of this is lacking in verity. What is also observed about the colorless aspect contributed by Pierce to the campaign and "the formulation of a programme which promised tranquillity and reassured the whole business community, North and South," is of a piece with the rest—fiction.

Passing over matters unimportant to the contention, it may be asserted with historic truth that the idea of comparative obscurity in respect to the Democratic candidate for President in 1852 is not supported by incontestible facts. Franklin Pierce was far from unknown to the people of the country. He had been in public life many years. He had served as Speaker of the popular branch of the New Hampshire Legislature in early manhood; he had been a Member of Congress; he had been a United States Senator; he ranked as an excellent lawyer, and in recognition of his legal abilities and as an expression of confidence President Jackson offered him the office of Attorney-General in his Cabinet. Pierce also won distinction as a soldier in the Mexican War, commanding with signal bravery and skill his brigade in several important engagements, and was the Bluecher of Scott's forces in the taking of the City of Mexico. Thus it is quite probable that he was pretty well known throughout the Union; to insist to the contrary would be a reflection upon general intelligence. Pierce was nominated because he had a record. He was not a noisy, demonstrative character, and he did not disappoint his party. The usual partisan bitterness was displayed in the canvass. Both Scott and Pierce received plenty of ungracious and acrimonious attacks characteristic of Presidential campaigns, unseemly as they are and appear after the heat of passion and the excesses of strife have subsided. From records of such exhibitions are often mistakenly formed estimates of public character and private virtue.

In his reference to Gen. Scott, "Democrat" is every whit as unhappy. If his purpose was to introduce a comparison as to Scott and the probable Republican candidate this year, there is, indeed, hardly the slightest similarity. Scott was perhaps a little vainglorious, but he was not endowed with that distinctive strenuosity; he was not so meddlesome, so importunate. His candidacy gave rise to no serious apprehension, he was not so exuberant, fantastic.

Furthermore, it was not such a programme as mentioned, nor so much the healing of so-called Barnburner schism in New York that elected Pierce. It was not the "reassured business community" either. Business was never threatened with greater disturbance and danger, resulting finally, at the conclusion of Pierce's term, in one of the most widespread, disastrous financial convulsions the country has ever experienced—the universal prostration and panic of 1857.

The result of the election in 1852 was largely due to causes found in the slavery question; that is the way-down fact. Threats were muttered; the country was feeling alarmed. The pro-slavery Whigs in the North went over to the Democratic party; they broke to it partly from fear; the South became substantially solid. The approaching storm of pro-slavery aggression, resulting in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise later on, thickened with cyclonic madness, and Pierce's election was a part and parcel of it. As for New York State, many Democrats who seceded from their party in 1848 never returned, but became first and foremost Republicans. It was the Silver Grays, not the Woolly Heads, that augmented the pro-slavery column.

My memory carries me back to slavery days, and very dark days afterward, now happily forever gone. But for all the years then, thenceforward and present a Republican, the inquiry often presses: Is the old party drifting? Has the chain parted; is the anchor lost? Shall the Constitution, long ago demonstrated to be something more than a rope of sand, be made a convenience and cover for partisan jugglery and heedless, headlong ambition?

The point is reached when there should be no room for doubt about the breadth, the depth and stability of the man to be made President. Accidents can rarely, if ever, be considered providential. It is reassuring to think that though parties nominate, the voters elect; and signs rather indicate at present that an election will be held next November with some surprises.

With regard to candidates, surprises too, have been and may be yet to come. So to speak, precedents do not always precede, or succeed. Circumstances and conditions make for lively consideration. Still, Lincoln was not known as widely as Franklin Pierce; Grover Cleveland was Governor but a few months, not long enough to be known much or to do much, yet he was a surprising winner. It would be useless, too, to attempt to get it out of the heads of a large number of American citizens that he proved a remarkable success.

Judge Parker's name really seems to be getting along strongly on pretty much the same course. If the Democratic party shall put into its national platform warp and woof of straight material, of strong fibre and good staple, a considerable garment may possibly be made of it.

But no tanner could be found who would give thirty cents for the political hide of any Democrat from New York State found at St. Louis attempting to compass the defeat of Judge Parker's nomination. The political fence is covered with pelts procured while hunters were out for just such game.

FREE REPUBLICAN.

NEW YORK, April 26.

A Scoundrelly Advertisement.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In a New York paper there appeared, a few days ago, under the heading, "Help Wanted, Female," an advertisement for "lady stenographers," from which this is an extract:

Must be well educated, high school or better; better preferred; none others need apply; clever, vivacious, brilliant conversationalist, very pretty; blonde preferred; stylish, fine figure, swell dresser, not over 20 to 25 years old, and weight not over 115 to 135 pounds.

Advertisements remarkable for the amount of check some men are capable of displaying have appeared before, but never have I seen or heard of anything which has quite come up to this specimen of the masculine infamy. It might be looked on as merely an attempt to be funny, but from my own experience and that of many stenographers of my acquaintance, I am led to believe that the writer was really in earnest.

Is not the condition of affairs indicated by this advertisement deplorable?

A man who could publish such an insult to an honorable profession honorably pursued by hundreds of self-respecting women ought to be ostracized. He is a scoundrel. M. L.

NEW YORK, April 26.

Classifying Him.

From the Fort Worth Record.

"Why, Colonel, when a man shows the white feather is it said that he takes water?"

"I do not know, suh; unless it is because the man who takes watah is such an object of contempt, suh."

RATHBONE'S CASE TRANSFERRED

Goes Now to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

WASHINGTON, April 27.—Mr. Platt of Connecticut, from the Committee on Relations with Cuba, to-day reported to the Senate asking to be excused from consideration of the petition of Estes G. Rathbone for an investigation into his conduct as a public officer in Cuba during American occupation.

Mr. Platt remarked that the committee had some doubt whether it had jurisdiction over the matter and also whether it had the power to grant any relief to Rathbone if it did investigate his case. He asked that the petition be referred to the Committee on the Judicary. This action was taken.

Rathbone, who was Director of Posts in Cuba, was convicted of misdemeanor in office and sentenced to prison, but escaped under the general amnesty act.

The Stevens Battery Guard.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Judging from the numerous communications I have seen of late in THE SUN, the Stevens Battery seems to be awakening considerable interest among the "old-timers." In 1862 this battery was in a depression in the dock nearly opposite Hudson Terrace, Hoboken, at that time the last street on the water front. It was surrounded by a high board fence, and was carefully screened from the public gaze. While rowing on the Hudson one afternoon with a friend, I passed the dock, and being curious to see what was going on, we spent some time looking around, as there was no one there, and no signs of any work being done in the yard. The vessel at that time looked more like a dismantled wreck than a ship, and was certainly not more than half finished.

Some weeks after our first visit we tried to make another call, but encountered a watchman, who did not seem at all inclined to sociability, but rather the reverse. This gentleman in his best days could hardly have been considered handsome, even by a fond and partial mother, and an injury he had sustained to one of his eyes did not add anything to his beauty, but rather accentuated the grim and savage expression of his countenance. He carried a large club, and was accompanied by a big bulldog of the brindle persuasion, with a large and cavernous mouth. This engaging animal was a good running mate for his master. Some canine acquaintance had bitten a large piece out of one cheek, and he was somewhat deficient in the matter of ears, having only a remnant of one of these useful appendages in stock.

The watchman looked us over for some time, and seemed to be trying to identify us with a band of criminals he had met somewhere. He finally expressed his views in unmistakable language, but with a total disregard of the niceties of grammar. As he put it: "You git! we don't want no darn loafers hangin' round here." As the bulldog and he seemed to be of one mind on this matter, we "got" and never went back.

Some years afterward I met one of the Stevens family at Seabright, and, in response to my inquiry, he told me the battery had been finished and presented to the State of New Jersey. OLD FOGY.

NEW YORK, April 27.

Delicate Legal Question.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In Section 276 of the Penal Code, regulating processions and parades in cities on Sundays, I find these provisions:

All processions and parades on Sunday in any city * * * are forbidden, and in such excepted cases there shall be no music, fireworks, discharge of cannon or firearms, or other disturbing noise."

Would the final clause of this section prevent the Congressman from the Eleventh New York district from participating in a parade or procession excepted from the general prohibition of the Section?

NEW YORK, April 27. THE PUMP.

Letters of a President.

1.

DEAR MISTER PRESIDENT: I am the father of twenty-two children and have voted early and often for the Party. My motto has always been, "the more the merrier," and I have struv to live up to it. Hoping to hear from you, yours respectfully.

LOBSTERIA, U. CYRUS EARLY.

2.

DEAR MR. EARLY: I was de-lighted to get your fine old letter. You and those like you are the hope of our common country. I enclose a photograph of yours most strenuously, T. R.

3.

DEAR MR. PRES: The letter you wrote Cyrus Early was published in the county paper. I am his wife. Could you send an offerin for the church fair next month? Respy, ROSE EARLY.

LOBSTERIA, U.

4.

DEAR SIR: I see your letter to Pop in a paper wunner de blokies had. Im his foist born and I'm innocent. I got five years more of my bit. Burglary. Cant you git me out, maybe I could cop some of the swag back. ABEL EARLY.

I'm in as Conky the Con.

DANNEMORA, N. Y.

5.

SIR: Cyrus's No. 2 is bragging that you are going to send her a copy of "Teddy by Jake" for the fair. I guess you dont know I'm Number One and 11 of those children's mine. Ask the Apostles at Salt Lake. BETSY EARLY.

LOBSTERIA, U.

6.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It was through your letter to him which was published here that I was able to get track of that bigamous deceiver, Cyrus Early. The trial comes off soon. I have heard of another lady who is after him, not a Mormon. Yours gratefully, AMANDA EARLY.

I have four.

CHIPMUNK, Nev.

7.

MR. PRESIDENT: I saw your letter to the old man. It was all right. Say, I got the best joint in town—Plate Glass Ed, I guess you heard of me—and whenever you come West it's yours as an old friend of dad's. Yours, ED EARLY.

LOBSTERIA, U.

8.

DEAR SIR: I read your beautiful letter to Poppa. Couldn't you send me one? It would be a winner as a press notice. I'm real strenuous—my record is 6 ft. 2 in. Yours most cordially,

Address: BIRDIE EARLY.

"La Belle Bizarre," Champion Lady High Kicker of the World.

MAD SQ GARD, N. Y.

9.

SIR: Reading of your friendship for Cyrus Early, thought I would write and ask you if you could adopt a couple of his offspring. We have nine of them here, and it's a pretty heavy charge on the county. Can you help us out? Respy,

HIRAM OFFUT,
Overseer of the Poor.

COUNTY FARM, Pestus Co.

The Magic in the Flag.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* There must be magic in the flag, since it enables your patriotic statistician to see two more stars in its galaxy than any one else has been able to discover.

WASHINGTON, April 26. H. K. ZELABA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Mr. Walter J. Ballard's prose poem in to-day's SUN begins "On the fields of Lexington and Bunker Hill it [the flag] nerved our heroes," &c. As our flag did this before it existed the magic might even be described as miraculous. "OLD GLORY."

NEW YORK, April 26.

A Bootblack's Plea for Precise Definitions.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Won't you please state that when a man wants a calf shoe blacked and polished by the brush he should ask for a polish, and that when he wants a vici kid shoe polished by paste and a cloth he should say "shine." Then we all would understand what was wanted and a lot of trouble would be prevented. Please state this in THE SUN. SHOE BLACKER.

NEW YORK, April 26.

Fell Off His Iowa Farm and Hurt His Leg.

From the Castana Times.

On a farm near Castana is a hill that is too steep to be truthfully described as rolling. The owner of the place was chopping a tree on the hillside the other day, and, losing his balance, fell and rolled to the bottom of the incline, severely injuring one leg. Asked afterward how the leg was injured, he replied that he fell off his farm and hurt it.

Her First Railroad Journey.

From the Frisco (Tex.) Journal.

An old lady who had never ridden on a railroad car recently visited a station and was shown into the waiting room. She took a chair and prepared to enjoy herself. After sitting quietly for half an hour she reached over and, touching a stranger on the arm, remarked: "It rides real easy, don't it!"

The Editorial Rooster.

From the Winchester Democrat.

There is some chicken cholera in our midst.