The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1908.

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 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer of the Association, William M. Laffan, 170 Nassau street; Secretary of the Association, Franklin Bartlett, 5 Nassau street.

Paris office, 32 Rue Louis le Grand. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel; Kiosque 77, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opéra, and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Italiens, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

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.

Mr. Taft and the Eye of a Needle.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in looking back upon the wide swath of destruction which his folly and his insane propensities precipitated upon his otherwise prosperous country must derive more or less comfort from the reflection that he does not suffer alone. It would be intolerable indeed to bear unaided so grievous a burden. Every day adds its thousands to the ranks of the unemployed and subtracts its thousands from the hard won accumulations of honest thrift. The suffering of hundreds has grown into suffering of thousands and is now swollen into that of hundreds of thousands, nay of millions, all of whom had no hand in the bringing of it about.

The other day the operating authority of a great railroad, in effecting a sweeping reduction in his forces, took occasion to observe that it had been rendered necessary by "Roosevelt prosperity" and that it would both last and increase so long as Mr. ROOSEVELT's notions of necessary reforms continued to obtain throughout the country. The remark seems to have struck a responsive chord in spite of its cynicism, always a repellent quality, particularly in writers for the press.

There is a growing conviction on all sides that there can be no effective or permanent restoration of the common industry and productivity until the morbidity of Rooseveltism has been eradicated from the body politic. Moreover, it must be a thorough and a complete eradication, one which will kill for all time the poison of jealousy, hatred, distrust and discontent which Mr. ROOSEVELT has sown with such impartiality and such skill. There must be no half way work about it: no delegation of his propaganda to a mere *locum tenens*, no substitution of something "equally as good" or "the kind you have always used." What is wanted is a return to peace, sobriety and steady habits and an utter obliteration of hysteria, quack reform and fictitious strenuosity. We are all tired, Republicans and Democrats alike, of the greatest "confidence game" that ever was played upon a too susceptible people.

It is in the fulness of this conviction, in the very obsession of this conviction, that we would persuade WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT that it is easier for one of the criminal rich to enter the Kingdom of Heaven than it is that he himself should pass through the eye of a needle. There is no use in his trying. The thing is impossible. Mr. ROOSEVELT can no longer cram himself down the once yawning gullet of the sovereign people. How much less shall he cram down his TAFT? Day by day the futility grows apace, while the fatuity persists and persists. But ever weaker and weaker; and in flabby impotence, like the despairing rage of the softer molluscs.

Decadence of the Southern Democracy.

Perhaps it would be too much to expect after six years of such a dispensation as we are now familiar with, that Mr. BRYAN's persistent exhibition of bad taste would exert any very disenchanting influence upon his admirers. The public mind has been so confused as to dignity, impudence, virtue, humbug, merit, pretension, patriotism and bluster that it has lost its sense of proportion together with its faculty of true appraisement. If thoughtful and intelligent Republicans fear to denounce and repudiate the mischievous vagaries of their present Leader, can we reasonably look to Democrats of the same class for anything more manly, independent and courageous?

Hopeful persons, however, had begun to expect much of the Democracy, especially of the Southern Democracy. They told themselves that the Bryan superstition could not endure indefinitely, and they dreamed of an awakening to the ancient ideals of good breeding and self-respect which would dispel the bonds of a deplorable obsession and restore once honored standards and observances. But, as it seems at present, the Democratic stupor is as profound as the infatuation on the other side. Faint and timid protests issue from the South—from Charleston, Nashville and other points. The valuable Mobile *Register* releases a moan of pain:

"Mr. BRYAN went into Kentucky and did what he could to put Democrats by the ears, and now he has come to Alabama and is interfering with our affairs in a wholly officious and pragmatic manner. If this is the best he can do to 'unite the party,' he will better serve the party by staying away."

The Nashville *American* employs still stronger terms. The *News and Courier* of Charleston will have none of him. But what are these piteous cries, issuing from distant ambushes, when the assembled representatives of the Democracy at Washington—the men who ought to speak for its courage, its intelligence and its noblest aspirations—maintain an abject silence? Where are BACON of Georgia, DANIEL of Virginia, CULBERSON of Texas—a hundred others who are the South's chosen spokesmen, who know that BRYAN's candidacy means a new disaster, and who in their hearts resent his insolent airs of domination and proprietorship?

Senator BACON said last June that any strong, clean, able and respected Southern Democrat could avert the calamity of BRYAN's leadership by the simple expedient of announcing his own candidacy. He spoke the truth, but where is the Southern Democrat with the necessary qualifications—and courage added? There was a time when such offensive pretensions as Mr. BRYAN has recently exhibited in Washington would have disgusted and alienated every self-respecting Southerner.

Apparently that time has passed.

To Shift the White Man's Burden.

Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. HEYBURN and some other Senators are deeply shocked at the existence or rumors of the existence of slavery or involuntary servitude in the Philippines, that blessed American annex of races and troubles. Mr. LODGE tried to calm the perturbed spirits by reading from the Philippine Code a prohibition of slavery. But where does prohibition prohibit? Hasn't the Hon. WILLIAM JOEL STONE, who so improved himself and "our Eastern possessions" last year by a personal visit, seen "a boy slave," the possession of an accursed Datto? Who will credit the yarn, told by some of the ungodly, that Mr. STONE, coming from Missouri and therefore in imperious need of authentic information only, was "personally conducted" to whatever he wanted to find? Some say that the "boy slave" of Sulu was exhibited in another part of the Sulu territory as "offspring of polygamous marriage," in another as "the next Sultan," and in still a third as "the orphan child of a victim of Igorrote head hunters." Enough to say that Mr. STONE needs no external stimulation to induce him to take out his copy of the Declaration of Independence and declaim tempestuously.

We must remind Mr. TILLMAN and his fellow abolitionists that slavery may well be found along with a large number of much stranger survivals in those 1,600 islands or more. Some tribes there are living in a state of civilization, or want of it, that makes them contemporary of implement and custom with the Iron Age or earlier. In that welter of races, languages and habits the inertia of centuries is not to be shaken off in a year or two; and laws imposed by a foreign authority are not executed easily in contravention of usage and self-interest.

Laws are obeyed so universally in the rest of the United States, however, that nobody can wonder at the horror which slavery in the Philippines makes to creep through Senatorial bosoms. Yet is there not a remedy, and one that may be even more helpful to the white than the little brown brother? May not this slavery debate, so futile in itself, beget a grand and healing idea?

What Shall We Do With Our Boy? That is the question which seethes in the midst of the American people. Will continuous shriek and shindy and bewhacking with the Big Stick still be the lot of the nation after March 4, 1909, or can the White Man's Burden be shifted to "our little brown brothers across the blue sea"? We know quiet is hell to that quick bosom; we know that the Filipinos need to be stirred up and made to reform. Suppose, then, that there is enough in the Philippines to keep the Grand Khan reasonably busy—what with the shooting, fishing, observation of nature, promotion of Ananias Associations, education of the Negritos and the rest of 'em as sharpshooters, &c.—to keep him reasonably busy and happy for some time; think of the good he can do. He can abolish:

Arrack, too strong,	Head hunting,
Arrows, poisoned,	Nakedness,
Boloing, unlicensed,	Polygamy,
Brigandage,	Slavery,
Graft,	Tattooing, &c.

Then there are twenty-five or thirty languages, and nobody knows how many dialects, in which that exhaustless ego can proclaim itself to new victims.

Is Russia's Alcohol Monopoly a Blessing or a Curse?

According to a despatch from St. Petersburg the most impressive speaker in the third Duma is one TCHELYSHEFF, a peasant by origin, who is a fanatic on the subject of temperance. When an optimistic account of the Government's fiscal prospects was given the other day he hurled at the Minister of Finance the charge that the budget was built up on the poison administered to the people: upon the destruction of their vital forces by drink, encouraged for the sake of swelling the public revenue. He proceeded to prove his assertion by voluminous details, showing that the Government stimulates drinking in every way, thanks to which its income from the monopoly of the manufacture and sale of alcohol is increasing year by year.

There seems to be no doubt about the facts. The assumption by the State of a monopoly of the manufacture and sale of alcohol, which Count WITTE in 1893 when he was Minister of Finance persuaded ALEXANDER III. to sanction, has proved a fiscal but not a moral success. Count WITTE urged that not only would the Russian people benefit by having unadulterated alcohol provided in sealed bottles bearing an official stamp but by the abolition of the "kabak" or private drinking saloon, with its demoralizing influences, they would be delivered from the temptation to indulge in excessive consumption of alcoholic beverages. It has turned out that although the people are not allowed to drink in the State shops the vodka which they buy, but must remove it from the premises, they consume not less but a great deal more. Statistics show that from 1861 to 1900 the quantity of alcohol consumed in Russia remained invariable, although the population doubled in the interval. Since the date last named, however, the net profit from the alcohol monopoly has increased rapidly. In 1901 it was 254,000,000 rubles; in 1903 it was 379,000,000, and in 1906 it rose to 504,000,000. The figures for the year 1907 are not yet available, but they are expected to show a further extensive increase. This in spite of the fact that the State pays 50 per cent. more to the distillers, who for the most part belong to the land owning class, than was paid to them by the private retailers of alcohol.

The peasant TCHELYSHEFF pointed out why the practical outcome of the State monopoly of alcohol was ruining his fellow agriculturists. Before the opening of the Government's shops every mir or village community had the right, by the vote of a majority, to shut up the local public house. Where, on the other hand, the "kabak" or private drinking saloon was suffered to exist, a certain yearly sum of money was exacted from it by way of license. The proceeds of this license aided the mujiks materially in the payment of taxes to the Government and rent to their landlords. In the province of Samara alone it was computed that the annual sum forthcoming from the private venders of alcohol to the village communities for licenses amounted to 1,000,000 rubles. As things are now the peasant has lost not only this source of income but also the right of closing the State grogshop, except by special permission of the Government, which is very seldom granted.

What TCHELYSHEFF demands is the complete interdiction of the sale of vodka, the alcoholic beverage principally drunk in Russia. For the Government to acquiesce in this demand is out of the question, for the State's expenditure could not be met without the profits from the alcohol monopoly. So deep an impression, however, has been made on the Duma by the peasant orator, even the Conservatives and Reactionists applauding him, that an attempt may be made to provide some palliative for the drink evil. In deference to the remonstrances at the suppression of the "kabak," which used to be regarded by the frequenters as a sort of club, Count WITTE established a number of temperance houses, where a workman or peasant could get a cup of tea and read a newspaper. The Treasury now allots some 10,000,000 rubles yearly to the purpose, but this substitute for the private grogshop is generally admitted to be a failure.

A United States Railroad Hospital Service

The difficulty of extracting the exact meaning from the bill introduced in the House by Mr. RHINOCK of Kentucky under the title "Creating a Railway Hospital Service Within the United States" may be judged from this sample paragraph, with which the measure begins:

"That for a railway hospital service for the United States, by establishing hospitals and hospital stations acquired by lease or construction, by purchase or donation, in cities and points along such railway lines of the various railway companies within the United States as the efficiency of the service may demand by way of hospitals or hospital stations fully equipped and in charge and control of the United States."

In spite of its blind and frequently meaningless construction this measure seems to indicate that Mr. RHINOCK wants to have the United States establish a Federal hospital service covering the railroads of the United States, to be managed by a surgeon-general at Washington, an assistant surgeon-general in each State and Territory, and a surgeon in each Congress district, all to be appointed by the President. To meet the expenses of the hospital system the railroad employees would be assessed not more than $1 a month each and the roads would contribute a cent a ton on all freight carried, this money to be paid into the United States Treasury semi-annually. Apparently Mr. RHINOCK expects to have the hospital force, and possibly the railroad men themselves, under military discipline.

When the service is established Mr. RHINOCK would have its surgeon-general, with the surgeon-general of the Marine Hospital Service and Treasurer of the United States "constitute the supervisors in chief of the national board of health," with full charge of the public health service within the United States "upon the land as well as upon the sea," and "to report only to the President."

A marvellous piece of legislation. Its principal defect seems to lie in the unfortunate fact that no one can be sure of the exact meaning of the bill. Mr. RHINOCK may be able to explain it. It is sure no one else can.

No Cotton Shirts for the Heathen.

Applause when bracketed in the *Congressional Record* is sometimes furnished by the orator himself in the copy he prepares for the public printer, but no suspicion attaches to the following excerpt:

"Now, what I want is to open our doors and give every naked heathen a cotton shirt." [Applause.]

The author of this altruistic sentiment is Representative ADAM MONROE BYRD of Mississippi, and the fact that he proclaimed it in a debate upon the Philadelphia immigration station bill apparently warrants the conclusion that he would throw wide open the door to the aliens of Europe and employ them to clothe the bareness of the heathen of the tropics. But it would be a perversion of Mr. BYRD's views. He is for limited and select immigration, especially for the Sunny South, and representing the "honest yeomanry" (so he terms his white constituents) of the Fifth district, he would invite the cream of that superior influx to the cotton lands of Mississippi to take the place of the negroes, who, he is gratified to say, are "taking the wings of the morning" and alighting in other parts of the national domain. "Honest white laborers" are coming in, and there may be room for the better class of aliens. No others, none of "the horde of miserable creatures now being dumped upon our shores," will be welcome to pick cotton and weave it into shirts. As Mr. BYRD said in the House:

"All this eloquence about assimilation with the American people is the merest nonsense. You might as well expect the waters of the snow fed brooklet flowing into the Stygian Gulf to remain sweet and pure as to hope for the blending of our blood with their blood without accelerating our own racial degeneracy."

To Mr. BYRD "the Sicilian class commonly called 'dagoes'" are especially repugnant: "hundreds of them may be seen in New Orleans to-day, three generations from Italy, still pushing carts, yelling 'Banana! Banana! Banana!'" [Applause.]

But while Mr. BYRD would welcome selected Italians and, above all, the clean and sturdy aliens from Northern Europe, he is haunted by the fear of a swelling tide of settlers to the Southland who would produce 20,000,000 bales of cotton each year, a calamity that would force the price down to five cents a pound. "It is useless," said Mr. BYRD, in the House, "to discuss the evils that would follow." That may be, but what becomes of the cotton shirt for the naked heathen if the negroes are allowed to take "the wings of the morning" and only a limited and choice assortment of aliens be let in with the native sons to produce just enough of the staple to save the South from five cent cotton? We are afraid that Mr. BYRD will have to sacrifice the naked heathen.

The Hon. CHARLES WARREN FAIRBANKS must read the history of his country more attentively, study the beadroll of her mighty sons or take lessons in mnemonics. It is not pleasant for the Hon. GEORGE PEABODY WETMORE, returning in triumph after his third election to that body which he has done so much to illustrate, to find himself forgotten by its presiding officer. "The Senator from—" says the Vice-President, floundering piteously while the Senate grins. This won't do. The injustice to Mr. WETMORE is perhaps less grievous than the injury to Mr. FAIRBANKS. If necessary the latter should have a nomenclator to remember for him. Or, if Mr. WETMORE rises in the Senate again, Mr. FAIRBANKS should keep repeating to himself: "GEORGE PEABODY, great philanthropist; ROGER WILLIAMS, Rocky Point, clams, greenings; ALDRICH, Rhode Island."

I only have to look into your eyes when they light up that way to be sure that each of you would determine how some man would vote.—*The Speaker of the House to a delegation from a young ladies' seminary.*

The above is widely quoted as reflecting the objection of Uncle JOE to woman suffrage, and his courage is extolled. But as all the young women but one came from Southern States there may have been more guile than valor in Mr. CANNON's opposition.

RAILWAYS OF NEW YORK.

Graphic Statement of the Importance of the City's Transportation Business.

From a speech by T. S. Williams of the B. R. T.

Of all public services in Greater New York, save perhaps the furnishing of water, the people are most dependent upon the railroads. The supply of electric light or gas may be interrupted, the cleaning of streets may be neglected, the police control may be inefficient, the machinery of government may be incompetent or corrupt, and the immediate effect upon the people is not sharply felt. But let the wheels of transit stop for one hour and outcries pour forth from hundreds of thousands of throats; let them stop for a day and business halts; conceive them to be stopped for a week and there would be commercial and municipal paralysis, with its deadening effect felt in every part of the civilized world.

The traction companies of Greater New York pay out every year, before their stockholders get a cent, half as much money as it costs to support the entire city government—to pave and clean its streets, to maintain its sewers, to protect its property from fire, to preserve its health, to provide schools and teachers, to maintain its police and the militia, to care for the dependent and criminal classes, to furnish water, gas and electricity, to administer its parks, to pay its officers and employees, to provide courts of justice, to maintain its public buildings, to pay the interest on its debt—in short, to meet all the requirements of the annual budget. No other single industry gives occupation to so many persons or supports so many families. None other contributes so much directly to the support of government. No other public utility enters so closely into the daily life of every individual. None other exhibits to the public so constantly and so completely every detail of its business—its tracks, its equipment, its power facilities, the efficiency of its management and employees, the extent to which it meets the demands of service—all these are exposed daily to the inspection and criticism of over 4,000,000 people.

Figuring each cash fare or transfer as one passenger, over 4,000,000 persons are transported every day, or twice as many each year as are carried by all the steam railroads of the United States. The lives and safety of these and hundreds of thousands more on the streets and public places are dependent upon the watchfulness and care exercised by the managers and employees of these great corporations—a direct and incessant human responsibility not borne by individuals, corporations or governments anywhere in the entire world.

From the Consuls of the Far East.

Attention is called by Consul-General Michael of Calcutta to the large and growing trade of Rangoon, Burma, where the United States is represented by a consular agent. The imports at that port during the six months ended September 30, 1907, amounted in value to $16,000,000, an increase of $1,179,330 over the same months of 1906. In the six months ended September, 1907, British India's imports amounted to $199,850,208, and exports to $319,509,698. Bengal and Bombay provinces do three-fourths of the entire importing by the six provinces, including Burma.

Consul Wilbur T. Gracey of Tsingtau, China, says that copies in English of the Chinese bankruptcy code of 1905 can be obtained from booksellers in Shanghai and Hongkong. The code was the work of certain Chinese students educated in Japan, and was revised by Wu Ting-fang.

The boom in India cotton yarns in Shanghai has run out, and the high hopes of India mills are dampened. Japan has forced her yarns into notice, and China is also more largely supplying the home market. India is looking westward for a market.

At the examinations held in Pekin for official degrees men who had studied in American universities were awarded the highest honors. Out of a large number examined only seven were given the highest degree obtainable, and of these five were graduates of the University of California, while the two others had studied in Japan.

A British consular report from Corea states that prospects for beet sugar culture in that country are bright. Experiments show a yield to the acre of twelve tons of beets with 10 per cent. of sugar. Farmers are financed by the sugar companies and get 50 per cent. of the yield.

Mysore State is forging ahead in internal improvements in the way of railways, electric trains, mills and factories, improved agricultural development, utilization of water powers for electricity, the opening of manganese and gold mines and in the education of the people. Makers of American mining, electrical, agricultural and saw mill machinery should exploit this State.

While the Belgian electric street railway lines in Tientsin, China, do not as yet pay much, the Chinese are riding on the cars in ever increasing numbers, and in a few years the company expects to make handsome profits.

The Chinese Ministry of Finance will establish a bank in Tibet to issue notes for circulation there.

China freely buys old horseshoes as the best class of iron for making fine tools and cutlery. The constant beating received by the shoes under the feet of the horses gives them a peculiar temper not obtainable in any other way. Shantung is by far the largest market for this class of iron in all China, says Vice-Consul Vollmer of Tsingtau.

The Burma Agricultural Department continues to devote a good deal of attention to the introduction of American tobacco into that province by distributing Havana and Virginia seed.

Nearly all of the plumbago exported from Ceylon comes to the United States. We took 15,495 tons out of 35,813 tons (total), the largest export of any year in the history of the trade.

The Onoda Cement Company of Tokio is erecting a cement works at Paotzukai, China. There is plenty of suitable limestone there. The company has received a grant of 1,488 acres of land. This is a chance to sell American cement making machinery.

Consul Hunter Sharp of Kobe, Japan, reports that the Dairi sugar refinery, situated on the coast of the Straits of Shimonoseki, near Moji, turns out from 200 to 250 tons of refined sugar a day, using a Buffalo made vacuum machine. Its full capacity is 400 tons a day. The factory employs 700 workmen. Mostly raw Java sugar is used, and most of the product goes to China and Corea. The size of the plant is to be doubled.

Japan has contracted with the German steel trust for 20,000 tons of rails.

CANADA'S UNSATISFACTORY SENATE.

OTTAWA, Jan. 27.—Canada does not know what to do with her Senate. There are many, probably the majority, who regard the present organization as a cumbrous and somewhat useless body, an obstacle rather than a help to legislation. The question of its abolition or its reorganization comes up from time to time. It has reappeared this winter, and it has recently been discussed at some length in the House of Commons.

The United States Senate is composed of ninety-two members. Canada, with about one-fourteenth of her big neighbor's population, has an upper house of eighty-seven members. Although less directly so than the House, the United States Senate is a representative body. The Canadian Senate has practically no representative quality. Its members are appointed for life by the Governor-General, who in the exercise of that power is in effect only the agent of the immediately dominant party. The life appointment feature is a serious factor in all schemes for a new arrangement. There are even difficulties in the way of their enforced retirement on full pay. The expense, which would be several millions of dollars, might be warranted by the obvious advantages which would follow the organization of a more effective body, but trouble would probably arise from the summary deposal of those who did not wish to be deposed.

When the Dominion was organized in 1867 under the British North America act Canada consisted of Ontario, Quebec, the Maritime Provinces and a vast wilderness practically uninhabited and generally regarded as uninhabitable. Ontario had twenty-four Senators, Quebec twenty-four and the Maritime Provinces twenty-four. This was regarded as a fair division of representation. At that time there were four provinces, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. To-day there are nine. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have ten Senators each. The new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, with ten times the area of the Maritime Provinces and probably now a larger population as well, have only four Senators each. Little Prince Edward Island has four Senators, while big Manitoba, with three times its population and thirty times its area, has four. British Columbia has three and Quebec and Ontario still have twenty-four as originally apportioned. This inequality in the upper house provokes complaint and criticism.

In a speech on the subject Sir Wilfrid Laurier admitted that he was quite uncertain about the best method of reform. He was disposed to urge an equal number from each province and would limit the term of service, subject to reelection or reappointment. He doubted the wisdom of the present method of appointment, but was equally in doubt regarding other methods that had been suggested. He was distinctly opposed to the abolishment of the Senate and disapproved hasty action in the matter. He said:

It is a matter of notoriety, it is a matter of history, that the Liberal party for many years past, even, I may say, from the very outset of confederation, have held the opinion that the constitution of the Senate has been unsatisfactory. The Conservative party were not of that opinion until recently, but if I am to take the last expression of their views in this matter from the leader of the party himself in a speech delivered at Halifax, they also have come to the conclusion that the constitution of the Senate ought to be amended. The difficulty has been not in pointing out defects but in suggesting a satisfactory remedy. The Liberal party have been in office for twelve years, and we have not been able to find a remedy which would be adequate to the defects we all see. In the speeches of the members of the Opposition I never found any concrete opinion as to what reform should be adopted. Changes we may make, but changes do not always mean improvement, and if we are to move in this direction I think we ought to move very slowly and carefully, in order to find out what would be the remedy for the evil which we all agree in seeing.

The fact that the present system has been in operation for forty years gives no ground for argument in its favor. The rapid development of the country during recent years has introduced new conditions and raised new questions. Until the Liberal party came into power in 1896 the complexion of the upper house was not a matter of grave importance. It was composed in large part of Conservatives and therefore in political harmony with the House of Commons. During the dominance of the Liberal party there have been no serious breaks between the two bodies, but there is always a possibility of what Sir Wilfrid called "a cleavage between the House of Commons and the Senate," and, as he further said, "nothing short of a revolution could unlock the difficulty." It is perhaps notable that no such cleavage has yet occurred. It is easily conceivable that the will of the people as expressed through a large party majority in the House might encounter an immovable obstacle in the shape of an Opposition majority in the Senate. A deadlock so created might last until the political composition of that body should be changed through the death of a sufficient number of the Opposition.

It is not at all probable that the Canadian Senate will be abolished, although there is a considerable pressure in that direction. It is not easy to see how a reformation can be brought about unless the Senators now or at some future time resign in a body. Such a course would make a heavy demand on individual patriotism, but it would certainly be a graceful and highly commendable act. It would remove a very grave difficulty and provide for the solution of one of Canada's most serious political problems.

Two Questions.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* May a humble truth seeker ask two questions? Is this country still governed according to the Constitution of these United States? Is an enlistment in the Rough Riders equivalent to the passing of a civil service examination?

SILAS FAIRWEATHER.

NEW YORK, January 28.

The Women of Winnipeg.

The west wind that wimpled the wild grass of old,
God's gift to the wild things that peopled the plain,
Is sighing and singing o'er oceans of gold,
And I too am sighing to see them again:
To westward the mountains and eastward the woods
And wonderful Winnipeg—there with the goods.

O women of Winnipeg, sunny and sweet,
I wonder how soon I shall see you again?
Brown hair and hair that's like ripening wheat,
And "atmosphere" fresh as the breath of the plain,
As bright as the morning bespangled with dew,
O women of Winnipeg—I'm all for you.

Fair dames whose brave husbands stand ready to die,
With no greater glory than death for your sake,
Fair damsels whose worshippers languishing lie
Nursing their hearts you so ruthlessly break,
Undervalued, mismeasured and misunderstood,
O women of Winnipeg—all to the good.

We smile when you smile and we weep when you weep,
You sweep every chord in a sensitive soul,
You cost a few heartaches and lose us some sleep,
Etcetera, etcetera, and yet on the whole
We love you; half human and wholly divine,
O women of Winnipeg—surely for mine.

The monk-man who knows not and never can know,
Who knows not he knows not, will never know why
We muse courting mortals should sing to you so,
Why brave men are ready to do and to die
For the love of you, nor will he stop to inquire,
O women of Winnipeg—under the wire.

CY WARMAN.

THE DISSATISFIED CLERGYMAN.

He Has Permission and Space Here to Say His Say in His Own Way.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I greatly enjoyed reading your editorial in yesterday's issue of your valuable journal upon "Some Dissatisfied Clergymen," in which you take occasion to comment with more or less freedom upon some remarks which I made last Wednesday evening before the Unitarian Club of this city. There are several reasons for my great enjoyment of this article. In the first place it was excellent fun, which, as Emerson says of beauty, is well nigh its own excuse for being. It constituted within itself as brilliant an example of ironic composition as I have read in many a long day, and my delight at its undoubted cleverness is not at all lessened by the fact that I chanced to be one of the targets at which you levelled your shafts of ridicule. In the second place it was with infinite satisfaction that I contemplated the fact that I had said anything which you deemed important enough to be mentioned, even ridiculed, in a prominent article upon your editorial page. It seemed good, I can tell you, to bask for one whole day in the splendor of THE SUN's rays and to know that a few of those rays were shining for me alone. And lastly it gave me surpassing joy indeed to find that you had felt it safe to admit within the sacred precincts of your journal such unholy and heretical views as those which I had ventured to state before the club, even though you admitted them only for the sake of ridicule and jest. I had been led to suppose by much reading of your paper that you had felt it necessary to protect your readers' minds from such dangerous and corrupting opinions as these of mine. But I am glad to find that your censor is not as strict as formerly.

I am particularly grateful for the accuracy with which you reported my statements—an accuracy not always found in the modern newspaper. You say: "He stated there were two or three men who owned the street railways of New York and were robbing the people of the right to adequate and decent transportation." (You omitted the two adjectives "adequate" and "decent," but never mind!) "He did not mention the names of these gentlemen," you continue in your report, "although he declared that their doings ought to be denounced in the pulpit." That is exactly what I said. I regard the history of the street railways of New York as one of the foulest scandals that ever polluted the record of a city's life. A gang of thoroughly unscrupulous men, under the shelter of a public franchise, has swooped down upon this city and plundered it, just as a band of pirates, under such freebooters as Morgan and Blackbeard, used in the old days to descend upon a helpless merchantman and strip her from stem to stern. These men, when all euphemistic terms have been cast aside, are thieves; and their deeds constitute, from the moral point of view, nothing but open robbery! And yet you ridicule me for asserting that the men guilty of these misdeeds should be denounced in Christian pulpits! Where, I may ask in the name of that God whom I have been taught to worship as a God of justice, should these men be denounced if not in Christian pulpits? I am so misguided as to think that that is just the place; and I have therefore denounced them freely in my pulpit at the Church of the Messiah in the past, and I shall continue to denounce them and all men like them in the future. I should consider myself recreant to my trust as a Christian minister did I keep silence in the face of such iniquity. You say that I did not give the names of these gentlemen in my address. You are again right—I did not! It was hardly necessary, since my audience consisted of men and women of average intelligence, who occasionally read the newspapers!

Again you say: "He informed his hearers that there was a small group of persons in complete control of the coal mines. He called these mines 'our mines,' although he did not disclose the basis of the public claim to ownership in which he evidently thought he had a share. Our impression was that the coal lands had been actually purchased and paid for by private and corporate owners, who had the same right to sell the products thereof as the farmer has to sell his milk." Here again you are entirely accurate in your report of my remarks. I am of course perfectly well aware of the fact, to which you think it necessary to call my attention, that "these coal mines had been actually purchased and paid for by private and corporate owners," and hence, in the strictly legal sense, are the property of these private and corporate owners and not "our" property. But I believe, sir, in all humility, although this will undoubtedly sound strange to your ears, that there is one standpoint which at all times and under all conditions transcends the merely legal standpoint, and that is the moral standpoint! And it was strictly from this moral standpoint that I was speaking on Wednesday night. I am one of those—possibly misguided—persons who believe that there are certain things which society has no moral right to hand over to the tender mercies of private individuals, and that among these things are coal mines, oil lands, forest tracts, public franchises of all kinds, whether railroad, telegraph or gas franchises, and so on. I regard it as an unspeakable iniquity that the supply of coal for our Eastern States should be in the hands of "divine right" Baer and his associates and that the public should be held up every winter by these money crazed men and forced to "pay the price." There are certain things which belong of right not to any individual, however rich or powerful he may be, but to society at large: and no statute law of any kind can annul this inalienable social right. It was in this sense of course that I spoke of the mines as "ours."

My attitude toward the private ownership of all public necessities and utilities is exactly that of the old anti-slavery leaders toward the private ownership of slaves. The slaves "had been actually purchased and paid for by private owners," as you say the mines have been. But this did not alter the fact that from the moral point of view no white man had any right to own a black man. And just as that fact is universally admitted to-day and all property rights in black men are permanently abolished, so is the time surely coming when the moral wrong of having public necessities and public utilities in private hands for the exploitation of the many by the few will be recognized and all property rights in mines, forests, railroads, &c., be abolished. This is the great problem of our day, just as the abolition of slavery was the great problem of half a century and more ago. And just as it remains an everlasting blot upon the record of the Christian churches of America that they assumed an attitude of indifference and oftentimes hostility toward this great crusade for the liberties of a race, so is it to-day a burning shame that the churches as a whole are standing indifferent and oftentimes hostile to the present crusade for the emancipation of an entire people. You were never wiser than when you said in your editorial "The right way is to act—act in the living present." That is exactly what some of us are trying to do in our humble way as regards the social and industrial iniquities of our time, even though we offend now and then those men and newspapers who would prefer to have everybody remain inert and quiescent, that existing conditions may know no alteration.

In closing may I thank you for including me among "some dissatisfied clergymen"? I am dissatisfied—dissatisfied at the hideous social conditions of our day and generation and dissatisfied at the spectacle of the Church of Christ standing deaf, dumb and blind before it all. A few more dissatisfied clergymen and we might be a bit nearer the realization of that Kingdom of God which Jesus of Nazareth endeavored to establish upon the earth, if I remember rightly something like 2,000 years ago!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES,
Church of the Messiah, Park avenue and Thirty-fourth street.

NEW YORK, January 27.

An Old Line Democratic Nomination.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I name as Democratic candidate for the Presidency James J. Hill of Minnesota and the world. Typical American, an honest and courageous business man, mighty doer and small talker, he is one who in his career from humblest to highest embodies all the best Americans are proud of. Furthermore, if nominated he would be triumphantly elected: more important still, he would make an ideal President. His nomination would drag by the heels all opposition as completely as Achilles did Hector about the walls of Troy.

"Not available," does some one say? Of course. The great Dispensers of Nominations, of whom we have two in the United States at present, and the people they represent would both be against him. The opposition does Mr. Hill the highest honor. Even our brave and true Cleveland was not more fortunate in his enemies.

If Mr. Hill were named the rush of conservative, constitutional Americanism to his support would hopelessly outswamp all the anarchy and socialism that could be brought to bear against him, whether emanating from a house painted white or from the editorial rooms of the *Commoner*, whether (God save us from the coincidence and all it may portend!) from Washington or Lincoln!

Even the most natural of contingencies, an alliance between Washington and Lincoln, could not prevail against Mr. Hill.

OLD LINE DEMOCRAT.

BROOKLYN, January 28.

WATTERSON ON BRYAN.

Activity of the Louisville Sage Thwarted by Eastern Apathy.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I am so used to being misquoted that I am grown callous to it; but some notice of the following, which I find in your Washington correspondence, seems to justify a word or two of rebuttal:

In his talks with fellow Democrats Mr. Watterson warmly approved Mr. Bryan as the Presidential nominee of his party. "Some time ago," he explained, "I attempted to work up a sentiment against him, but failed. To-day he is the undoubted choice of a vast majority of Democrats and the strongest man in the country, and it would be wrong not to nominate him."

I have at no time "warmly approved" Mr. Bryan for anything. Quite eight months ago I undertook a systematic and, as I thought, an intelligent campaign designed to organize such a volume of public opinion as would convince the Nebraskan that short of some economic cataclysm he could not hope to carry any of the debatable States and therefore could not be elected. All that is being said now against his candidacy I said then, though I wrote in a spirit of conciliation. The lesson of 1904 admonished me that he and his friends must be satisfied to unite the party and elect any ticket.

Mr. Bryan said in response that if the party could find a man likely to get more votes than himself he would be for that man, but that the man must be "a regulation Democrat." Then I said that if Mr. Bryan were sincere in this I could name him a man answering his requirement, who certainly fulfilled all other requirements. Ultimately it came out that I had Governor Johnson of Minnesota in mind. There followed six months of newspaper guying of one sort and another, not a syllable of serious consideration. Mr. Bryan naturally construed this to mean that my appeal had met no answering voice—he announced himself a candidate—each possible competitor, Governor Johnson, Governor Folk, Senator Culberson, declared they would not oppose him—Denver, a Bryan stronghold, was chosen for the national convention—and nothing is surer than that he will be nominated. The only effect of Mr. Bryan's defeat would be a repetition of 1904. The Bryan idea has so sandbagged the politicians and buncoed the back settlements as to bring enlightened Democrats to a state of inanition and to drive the independent vote away, except in the doubtful event of hard times.

I simply threw up my hands in despair and accepted the inevitable. Yet if I had had six months ago in timely cooperation half the zeal now displayed by the Eastern end of it, we could have carried our point, uniting the party on some other than Mr. Bryan; but it could not be because you Eastern people, who think you know it all, in reality rarely learn anything of the country at large until it is too late.

HENRY WATTERSON.

NAPLES-ON-THE-GULF, Fla., January 27.

THE RED CROSS.

Alleged Inconsistencies in the Society's Attitude Toward Doctors.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I am indeed greatly indebted to "W. P. H." for the information regarding the use of the red cross. At the same time I must confess that my opinion on this matter remains much as before. A somewhat critical examination of section 4 of the act providing for the incorporation of the American National Red Cross leads me to the belief that it is not open to one interpretation alone, and whether it is construed narrowly or liberally depends upon the ruling of the court before which such a question might be brought.

For my own part it seems too difficult to understand how the use of a red cross sign on his automobile merely on hurry calls where a person's life is in danger may be viewed "for the purposes of trade or as an advertisement to induce the sale of an article." Medicine or surgery may be the doctor's profession, but his use of the red cross to save a life is hardly for the purpose of increasing his business. How does such a use and purpose differ in any respect from the use and purpose of the same sign on a hospital ambulance?

As "W. P. H." says, "Law is law." True. Let us find out what the law really is, and then let us live up to it. That is the duty of every good citizen, but it is also his duty to know what is legal. In this particular case it is not very clear. Furthermore, from the fact that this law (if it is a law) is not lived up to by manufacturers, barbers, &c., but ignored with impunity, would it not appear to be one of those blue laws that no one pretends to obey? If the Red Cross society has an exclusive legal right to the use of the red cross sign and objects to its use by others, why does it not prosecute such persons indiscriminately? Why does it not make a test case and force every one to live up to the law? Why does it send out intimidating letters and "talk big" and do nothing?

The situation is positively ridiculous, and puts the Red Cross in anything but a favorable light. The doctor in question, unfortunately for his own interests, had a conscience; he believed what he was told, and he did not wish unpleasant notoriety. But had he been willing to ignore those things apparently he could have continued to use the red cross sign unmolested. Is this a square deal, and does it encourage people to live up to the law? Does it not do the reverse?

But the position of the Police Department is certainly peculiar. If the department has been authorizing illegally the use of the red cross to the doctors, why does not the society strike at the root of that particular trouble and take steps to prevent such licenses further being granted?

CITIZEN.

NEW YORK, January 28.

Badges for Doctors.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* If an emblem is desirable to distinguish and facilitate the progress of the physician through our streets and the Police Department is not empowered to use the red cross sign for the purpose, why not devise a special one to be attached not to the body of the vehicle in which the physician is making haste but to his own proper person, that others may read while he runs?

Barring the fact that the late Colonel Waring appropriated to the use of his department a slight alteration of the sign of our time honored invocation to Jupiter I would suggest that this be used. A suitable badge marked "R" could be issued to all desiring it, and the proud possessors of the devil wagon would not be lifted as they now are above their humble brethren of the horse and foot brigade.

J. P. D.

NEW YORK, January 28.

The Copyright of the Emblem.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The red cross has been protected by copyrights of Major Goetz since January, 1890. He was acting Surgeon-General of the National Guard of New York, encamped at Peekskill, N. Y., and in July, 1887, organized the first temporary ambulance corps for said camp duty, and at that time decorated his men with the red cross emblem, afterward recommending it to the Governor. Later it was adopted by the Legislature and subsequently copyrighted by Major Goetz. Consequently the prima facie rights belong to Major Goetz and any person or persons using the red cross emblem are infringing upon the copyright and are liable to be sued for damages.

Major Goetz is a member of the N. G. S. N. Y. from 1870, and one of the oldest surgeons on the staff. He has been decorated on several occasions for faithful services. He was also one of the first of the medical officers who offered their services to the Government in the late Cuban war.

M. W. G. L.

HOBOKEN, January 28.

More Treason.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Thanks to Mr. Choate for the "Put up or shut up." And let then another rule be observed: "Keep silent or tell the truth."

His Magnificence should be forced within bounds in more ways than one.

E. T. W.

NEW YORK, January 28.

The Tokio Fair.

The Grand Exhibition of Japan will be opened at Tokio on the first day of April, 1912, and will be closed on the thirty-first day of October of that year.

All foreign Governments and peoples are invited to participate. For the instalment of foreign exhibits belonging to the five departments of education, science, machinery, electricity and manufactures, space will be provided in the exhibition buildings erected by the administrative office of the exhibition. For exhibits other than those above designated, any nation may erect a separate building at its own expense. No charge will be made for space allotted for such building. If they so desire any foreign nation may exhibit articles belonging to the five departments named, in its own building.

All exhibits, building materials, decorations, &c. will be admitted free of duty, if not used for commercial purposes. Special arrangements as to duty will be made on articles for sale at bazaars or for amusements, in the exhibition. Special protection by law will be afforded to all inventions, designs, models of utility and trademarks of foreign exhibits.

Looking Up.

The lumber market's flat, they say—
Lifeless, listless, limber.
And yet there's quite a movement now
In Presidential timber.

ED MOTT.