

THURSDAY, APRIL 9, 1908.

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

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid. Daily, Per Month, \$1.00; Per Year, \$10.00. Sunday, Per Year, \$2.00. Daily and Sunday, Per Year, \$12.00.

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.

The daily and Sunday Sun is on sale in London at Murray's Exchange, Trafalgar Buildings, Northumberland avenue. Fall Mail American and Colonial Exchange, Carlton street, Regent street, and Dawson's Steamship Agency, 11 Green street, Leicester Square.

Paris office, 32 Rue Louis le Grand. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 15, near the Grand Hotel, Kiosque 7, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opera, and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Italiens, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

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

The Federal Machine in New York.

Mr. ROOSEVELT'S prodigious proficiency in the art of political chicanery is disclosed with convincing force in his own State. Beneath the cover of a generous sentiment attributed to Mr. TAFT, which implied that there was to be no undermining of Governor HUGHES, that he was to be undisturbed in the enjoyment of his full quota of delegates, New York's favorite son finds himself to-day bereft of his following.

Even the perfunctory and negligible compliment of the presentation of the name of CHARLES EVANS HUGHES in behalf of his State in the Republican convention may be denied him. While we have had reason all along to regard Mr. HUGHES'S candidacy as illusory and have known that the Federal machinery would be corruptly manipulated against him, it has appeared otherwise to a great part of the public and to Mr. HUGHES'S many friends. We cannot compliment the Republican party upon the achievement, complete as it is. On the contrary we make special and unreserved proffer of our hearty contempt!

If Mr. TAFT ever said that he desired that the Governor of New York should be left undisturbed we do not for a moment question his sincerity and his honesty. It is possible that he did so, but we doubt it. To us it has more the aspect of one of those Machiavellian works of art which the Associated Press and other subservient if unconscious agencies disseminate with such assiduity from Washington. We hold Mr. TAFT as wholly above that sort of thing. His sincerity and ingenuousness cannot be impugned. If he were cast to-morrow for part of *Orpheus* he would straightway put off black himself all over but he would eat a whole huckleberry pie. Acting a lie and deliberately profiting out of it is something that is impossible to WILLIAM H. TAFT. It belongs to a higher order of genius than his.

According to Washington advices Mr. TAFT has seven-eighths of the delegates to the national convention. Why, then, this intense effort, this frantic anxiety in his behalf? Why (Mr. ROOSEVELT'S deplorable letter to FROELICHER to the contrary notwithstanding) this turbulent activity of the immense army of Federal officeholders and Federal spies? If the people are so overwhelmingly for the pseudo-candidate, why all these schemes to raise money, these projects to license corporations, to issue "letters of marque" to malefactors and predatory plutocrats for a consideration; to repeat, in fine, the blackmail and extortion of the year 1907?

The press has told how Secretary TAFT'S brother, CHARLES P. TAFT of Cincinnati, has contributed so far \$750,000 toward the expenses of the campaign. We do not believe anything of the kind. It is true that the gentleman in question is one of the most generous and warm-hearted men and earnestly desires his brother's success, but we have not known and deem it impossible that WILLIAM H. TAFT has been conducting that sort of a campaign. In the event that Fate under the wireless guidance of Genius should acquiesce in the Chicago programme, how nearer than a brother to the Great this profoundly astonished Mr. CHARLES P. TAFT would be!

Coming Naval Wars.

The discussion of the latest revision of Germany's naval programme, which provides for the laying down of four battleships of the Dreadnought type every year up to and including 1911, has called forth an interesting pamphlet by M. LAUBBEU, former chief constructor of the French navy. He begins by expressing the conviction that the question of supremacy in the Pacific will eventually have to be settled by heavy guns in favor either of Japan or of the United States, but he foresees a truce until the Japanese Dreadnoughts now under way are ready for sea. Inasmuch as the war would be a purely naval conflict, he thinks that Japan could stand the financial strain, but he expresses no opinion concerning the upshot of the contest.

The pamphlet, however, is mainly devoted to an announcement of the writer's belief that a trial of strength upon the ocean between Germany and Britain is inevitable. He also directs attention to the fact that if Britain is to remain as inconspicuously inferior to Germany in respect of sea power at the end of 1915 as she is to-day she will have to build seventeen great battleships in the next four years. Her present naval programme provides for only two in the coming twelvemonth, but Mr. ASQUITH, speaking for the Government, has said that next winter and thereafter measures will be taken to keep the British navy up to the "two Power" level. Under the circumstances what possible chance would Germany have of securing maritime ascendancy?

M. LAUBBEU replies that it might be done in two ways. The Power which shall be the first to build battleships of 25,000 tons, high speed and huge armaments,

will at once render even the existing Dreadnoughts obsolete. As a matter of fact, however, Germany is not pursuing that course at present. Her newest ships are merely imitations of British vessels. What alternative plan, then, is there by which Germany might succeed in wresting the mastery of the sea from Britain? M. LAUBBEU answers that owing to the magnitude of the appropriations for the purpose Germany by 1915 may have as many as sixty submersible vessels ready for action. He suggests that before war broke out these submersibles might be sent to British harbors, there to wreak havoc among the assembled warships. He deems it not impossible that in this way sufficient damage might be inflicted to equalize the battle fleets of the two countries. The landing of German troops might follow, and then in all likelihood Britain's history would be ended.

To British statesmen, on their side, two alternatives are open. They may continue to spend two millions of pounds sterling annually to Germany's one million, applying the money either to multiplying the number of Dreadnoughts or to the construction of battleships of greatly superior size and efficiency; or else, if Britain should become tired of suffering a limitless drain upon her resources she might with a sudden, crushing blow break the power of the German fleet before it reaches full development. M. LAUBBEU, for his part, is convinced that the second course will be followed. He foresees, he says, that Britain will suddenly attack the German fleet and break it, as she broke successively the sea power of Spain, Holland, Denmark and France. This accomplished, he takes for granted that she will turn and crush the victor in the war between America and Japan for preponderance in the Pacific. "Thus," he says, "would Britain's mastery of the sea be assured for another fifty years."

Wait Until the Weather is More Appropriate.

While we are heartily in favor of inflicting condign punishment upon CIPRIANO CASTRO, we have a very strong impression that the whole matter can be advantageously and wisely deferred until Congress reassembles in December. In the first place, there is evidently no imperative need for hurry. CASTRO and his derelictions are brought to the attention of Congress at this particular juncture solely to serve Mr. ROOSEVELT'S political ambitions and personal ends. Any thoughtful review of the documents in the case will show how long it has been pigeonholed in the State Department awaiting the psychological moment for its production.

CASTRO cannot get away, and there are no interests involved apparently which have not learned to await Mr. ROOSEVELT'S convenience and may therefore easily await the convenience of Congress and the convenience of the American public.

We disapprove of converting the larger affairs of State, particularly when they concern our relations in this hemisphere, to the vulgar use of demagoguery and political buffoonery. There is absolutely no urgency, so far as this country is concerned, in the adjustment of our affair with Venezuela. Besides, it will surely be the part of wisdom to defer it until we have some of our ships in-Atlantic waters, in case of possible complications, as well until a season more propitious and suitable for tropical duties.

The Mystery of Wayne Parker's Vote.

Yesterday we had the honor to report our anxiety to learn the exact opinion of the Hon. RICHARD WAYNE PARKER of New Jersey about the Sterling employers' liability bill, for which he voted with the majority of 300 and against the minority of one consisting of Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The occasion of our solicitude is highly creditable to Mr. PARKER. He is an honorable legislator, an intellectually self-respecting man, and, like Mr. LITTLEFIELD, he brings to the consideration of questions of constitutional law an uncommonly clear head. Besides, the Hon. RICHARD WAYNE PARKER stands high on the Committee on Judiciary. His name is second in the list, while Mr. LITTLEFIELD'S is fourth.

Could it be possible that the constitutional objections which caused Mr. LITTLEFIELD to confront in dignified solitude that preposterous majority of 300 unthinking or complaisant or cynically indifferent candidates for the applause of "Labor" seemed of no account to a mind like the Hon. RICHARD WAYNE PARKER'S?

The Congressional Record of April 6 brings an answer which solves our doubts in one respect while increasing our perplexity in another. Mr. PARKER not only spoke in the House against the Sterling bill in its present form, but he also signed and submitted, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, a report defining his position on the subject. This report was stronger, if anything, than that in which his colleagues, Mr. LITTLEFIELD and Mr. BANNON, recorded their protest against this hasty and inconsiderate legislation for politics. What Mr. PARKER thought of the measure for which he subsequently voted may be inferred from these passages in his report on the bill:

"The subject is too complicated for me or any one else to be sure that his views are right, but it is too important for any legislation to be passed which is manifestly imperfect. It is better to do nothing than to create any system where most of the money paid shall go to the profits of an insurance company or legal expenses, or to pass a law which may be held unconstitutional."

"With reference to territory not within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States and the mutual relations of employees and employers engaged in interstate commerce, I have seen no cause to change my opinion that such enactment upon the bill that was held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. I believe that the question should be left to the law of the State having jurisdiction of the employment, and that the jurisdiction of the contract of service should not be made national because the employer is engaged in interstate commerce."

"The attempt to pass such a law will cause inevitable confusion as to where the State and National law should govern, especially in the case of local employers."

"Pass this bill and it would add 20,000 cases in the United States courts and subject plaintiffs

to appeals to United States courts of appeal which, if these cases be added, might take ten years. I do not believe in that legislation which will cause this result, as I doubt also whether it is constitutional to take all questions between employer and employe away from the State."

These are Mr. PARKER'S views of the Sterling employers' liability bill of 1908. His judgment was as strong against it as it was against Mr. ROOSEVELT'S previous pet measure of 1906, declared unconstitutional last January by the Supreme Court of the United States. His speech two years ago this April against the original employers' liability bill was a warning which his party in Congress did not heed. It required the memorable decisions of the highest tribunal in the Howard case and in the Adair case to prove to the country that Mr. PARKER was right then and that Mr. ROOSEVELT was wrong, as was the facile majority which in spite of Mr. PARKER'S protest put through that political measure without even the formality of a call of the Yeas and Nays. And Mr. PARKER is no less convincing now in his protest, along with Mr. LITTLEFIELD, against the present attempt to patch up that previous unconstitutional law, riddled by the court's decision.

Thus far all is clear enough, and Mr. PARKER'S courage and independence shine even as luminously as Mr. LITTLEFIELD'S. The perplexity begins when we turn from the language of his report on the bill's unconstitutionality, ill advised and dangerous quality to the speech, on page 4555 of the Record, in which Mr. PARKER announces his reason for parting company with Mr. LITTLEFIELD and voting for the very measure he had so vigorously and convincingly denounced:

"I shall vote for the bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] I shall vote for the bill in the hope that it will be amended before it is finally passed, so as to be constitutional."

When have we heard anything like that from a man anything like RICHARD WAYNE PARKER? On that principle, why need the conscientious legislator ever hesitate between the voice of his conscience and the urgent appeals of partisan discipline? What measure can be so outrageously bad, so manifestly dishonest in its inception and promotion, so palpably unconstitutional, that a Congressman may not vote for it with the vague hope that somewhere and somehow the objections will be removed, the crookedness straightened, the unconstitutionality rectified, before it finally reaches the statute book? What a lubricant for the conscience is this theory: what a relief to the lawmaker's sense of duty and responsibility!

So the Hon. CHARLES E. LITTLEFIELD and the Hon. RICHARD WAYNE PARKER on this occasion parted company. Mr. LITTLEFIELD, having perceived the unconstitutionality of the Sterling bill, voted against its enactment, and his Nay found no echo save from the ceiling of the Chamber. Mr. PARKER, equally convinced of the bill's unconstitutionality, equally positive in his denunciation of its provisions, expressed the hope that it might be amended so as to make it constitutional before it was finally passed, and proceeded to vote for it along with the 300, amid applause from the Republican side.

"That was the difference. Has it come to this, that in order to dare to cast a vote of conscience, when the same is distasteful to Mr. ROOSEVELT and obnoxious to Mr. GOMPERS, a Republican statesman of conspicuous courage and independence must previously, like Mr. LITTLEFIELD, announce his impending retirement from public life?"

Tammany Relents.

It is announced, apparently officially, that Tammany is not to make an effort to exclude the Hon. P. HENRY MCCABREN of Kings county from the Democratic State convention next week. Perhaps it has been sufficiently impressed on Tammany that Mr. MCCABREN is what is called in the reprehensible language of the street "a live wire."

So far the efforts of Tammany and its allies against the Brooklyn leader have not been conspicuously successful. The brilliant scheme to eject him from the Democratic State committee had to be abandoned. The expeditions against his strongholds have come to naught. In the matter of keeping the tiger on his own side of the bridge, in fact, Mr. MCCABREN has been far more potent than the Fusion generals of 1903 or HUGH McLAUGHLIN ever were.

It is proclaimed vociferously by those who do not like the man that P. HENRY MCCABREN is a bold and wicked person. Bold he unquestionably is; wicked he may be, for he has associated with politicians for many years and their influence must be bad even on the sweetest and most delicate nature; but in spite of this it must be admitted that he is a person whose ability to get and hold what he wants is not in any way to be despised.

Philosophical and Historical Examination of the Cocktail.

To stir or not to stir a cocktail is a matter to give us pause less than the question: What is a cocktail? This was generally touched upon by one of the several informed correspondents who have favored us with views evoked by the current discussion of how an old-fashioned cocktail is, has been or should be made. Basing belief upon such respectable authority as is available, it seems safe to assume a certain fundamental negative, and so restrict the scope of inquiry. That is, *eau sucree*, flavored with nutmeg and heartened with two (or more) fingers of straight goods is not a cocktail of any fashion, old or new. It is a toddy. As to the *obiter dictum* of a correspondent that it should be drunk before breakfast, it, we sternly maintain, depends upon the breakfast hour.

What, then, is a cocktail? To say that it is a dream, and let it trickle at that, is to drift into pleasing mists of inexactitude where poets dwell. It is to sidestep. To consult the dictionaries is to invade a company no less inexact, perhaps, but somewhat less misty.

However, Webster says that a cocktail is "a beverage made of brandy, whiskey or gin, flavored or sweetened," the Standard, an "iced drink made of spirits mixed with bitters, sugar and

aromatic flavoring"; Farmer's "Americanism" gives more details, "a wine-glass of brandy, whiskey, gin or other spirit, to which is added a teaspoonful of bitters, with a pinch of sugar, and crushed ice, whisked briskly round until the mixture, sparkling and foaming, nearly overruns the vessel in which it is made"; Bartlett's "Dictionary of Americanisms" is the only authority which admits water, but it is moderate in this subject, concluding its list of ingredients with "a very little water."

Reddell's "Fact, Fancy and Fable" includes under one of its titular classifications the story that the cocktail was invented in 1779 by one ELIZABETH FLANNAGAN, who kept a house of inspiration in the road between Tarrytown and White Plains, Westchester county, where she served her admired beverage to American and French officers, who fought the hardships, the horrors, even the politics of war under the spell of Dame FLANNAGAN'S magic mixture.

Our search has yielded these important points: whatever spirit forms the basic principle of the cocktail there must be added sugar (or syrup), bitters, and if you wish, aromatic flavoring, which may be vermouth, in which case the Manhattan Cocktail of general commerce stands revealed.

Waste of City Money.

No one possessed of even a slight acquaintance with the methods that obtain in the transaction of the city's business will doubt that the estimate of \$2,000,000 as the amount wasted in the last five years in a few bureaus of one borough is conservative. This sum does not include the money paid unnecessarily for lands bought, or what may be called the excessive expenditures on capital account. It comprises merely the waste and thievery in the maintenance of necessary public works, the days paid for on which no labor was done, the flames improperly or illegally carried on payrolls, the overtime "graft" and the like.

Nor is the one borough of which this estimate is made unique or even bold in its manner of robbing the taxpayers. In the investigation of the affairs of Manhattan the grossest mismanagement, to say the best of it, was disclosed. The affairs of Queens have had an airing recently. The telephone bills of the Brooklyn borough administration have been called to public attention by Comptroller METZ. Richmond has not been shaken up yet. It is small and poor, but its turn may come.

As notorious as this misuse of the city's money is, it is cheerfully accepted by the public, and no serious effort is made to prevent it. The voters are capable of high excitement in the few weeks of the campaign. They apparently care nothing for their corporate affairs during eleven months of the year. So, as they think of the abuses under which they suffer, they may comfort themselves with the reflection that they are treated as they deserve to be, and that while the enterprising persons who rob them are highly blameworthy and culpable, in the end the principal fault lies with themselves.

This is the political situation in a nutshell: A man who isn't nominated expects to be defeated for President by a man who says he will not run.

Our eminent friend CHARLES ROOPERS of Chicago writes to suggest that Mr. ROOSEVELT shall take the second place on a ticket headed by TAFT. The distinguished gentleman loads a postal card with these pregnant thoughts:

"This ROOSEVELT would really offend himself and nobody be any the wiser. Furthermore, Mr. ROOSEVELT could endure such ignominious defeat on one more and more. What are you to think of the mental attitude and moral makeup of Professor J. W. Jenks? According to the reports in the papers he has been telling why certain things have been inserted in the bill. For instance, he gave the astonishing information that when a corporation whether the corporation could legally be compelled to divulge certain information... not connected with interstate commerce... a provision had been inserted in the bill allowing the President to refuse their registration unless they furnish such information."

Sources of State Revenues.

Table listing sources of state revenues for Rhode Island in 1907, including State tax, Savings bank tax, Life insurance companies, Foreign investments, etc.

The Democratic Golden Opportunity.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—If we can nominate Judge Gray we can carry Pennsylvania.

The country wants a rest, and with a man in whom both capital and labor have confidence, with a fair judicial mind at the helm, business of all kinds will start at once.

WEST CHESTER, Pa., April 7.

The Wrestling Championship.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—I would have been proud if the world's wrestling championship had been fairly won by an American, but the gorge crawl at the outrageous deal that Hackenschmidt got at Chicago.

If Hack could not be defeated save by gouging, oil smearing, nose and ear wrenching, then for the sake of American sport let it be recognized that we have no athletic capacity of coping with him. A championship acquired in so foul a manner causes us international discredit.

MODIFIED PROHIBITION.

WASHINGTON, April 8.—The passage of laws prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in many States has brought to the front a perplexing question of State and Federal authority. As the matter now stands Federal legislation is needed to make State legislation properly effective. The story of the case proceeds by way of the "original package" decision of the Supreme Court and the so-called Wilson bill of 1890 to its present status.

The "original package" decision recognizes the right of residents of prohibition States to obtain liquor by purchase from dealers in States where the sale of intoxicants is not unlawful if the shipment is made in an original package, whether bottle, jug or barrel. The Wilson law gives to the State under its police power the control of such shipments "on arrival in such State or Territory." Commenting on this law on December 15 of last year Senator Tillman said:

"Now, that is the law. The court in explaining or in interpreting the meaning of Congress has decided that the goods to be shipped to the States until they have been delivered to the consignee, and from one degree of intoxication to another they have gone on until they are absolutely unfit for use outside liquor dealers to send whiskey into the States for sale."

Under this interpretation liquor dealers in non-prohibition States are wont to ship large collections of jugs of different content and capacity to places in prohibition States. These are sent without specific orders from patrons and are addressed to John Doe, Richard Roe or any other name that may be adopted. The shipment is made by express C. O. D. As a result thirty souls in hundreds of arid districts may go to an express office, as they would go to a lawful dispensary, and claim a one dollar or two dollar consignment to John Doe or some other and obtain as much liquor as they want and as often as desired so long as their dollars and the John Doe consignments hold out. In effect the express office becomes a sales depot for liquor in original packages.

This practice is manifestly a wrong and an injury to communities which see fit to prohibit the use of liquor and to prohibit its sale. Their purpose is defeated by decisions of the Federal courts, and the position of the courts is unquestionably sound. It is, briefly, that liquor is a legitimate subject of commerce and that a dealer in a "wet" State may ship his merchandise in an original package to a consumer in a dry State. The traffic cannot be entirely abolished, but its present evils are open to decided abatement.

Several bills relating to the matter were presented during the last session of Congress and some have been presented during the present session. The indications are that perhaps after an animated debate a bill will be passed by which a stop will be put to some of the particularly offensive features of the present custom. It will probably prohibit C. O. D. shipments on the ground that they are sales made in violation of State laws. It will probably provide that all shipments of the kind in question shall be made in good faith as a result of specific orders for the goods and that the names of consignors and consignees shall be genuine. There seems little reason to doubt that such a bill would be supported by the courts. It is possible that a bill of larger scope may be approved. There are many who believe that the Federal authority may lawfully surrender a portion of its control over interstate commerce and grant to prohibition States the right to exercise police power over the liquor traffic at their borders. They believe that when a consignment of liquor crosses the State line it shall become their and not subject to the laws of the State and fully released from Federal control.

A Paser for Professor Jenks.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—The developments in the hearings on the Hepburn bill amending the Sherman anti-trust act furnish one more and more. What are you to think of the mental attitude and moral makeup of Professor J. W. Jenks? According to the reports in the papers he has been telling why certain things have been inserted in the bill. For instance, he gave the astonishing information that when a corporation whether the corporation could legally be compelled to divulge certain information... not connected with interstate commerce... a provision had been inserted in the bill allowing the President to refuse their registration unless they furnish such information.

This is correctly reported, is indirection with a vengeance. It seems incredible that a professor of law at a reputable college could father such a squint-eyed proposition and naively state it before a Congress committee.

In plain terms, once a corporation registers under the proposed law it is to be big game out of its legal rights at the will of the President, and in this case the President would be a mere legal fiction. Information of the highest value to competitors would be at the mercy of a 300 member body in Washington. No business would be safe. Let us have straight law, but no trickery, no indirection.

Dr. Warne on Work for the Unemployed.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—In your report this morning of the Ethical Society League meeting at the Hotel Astor yesterday on the question of the unemployed it is stated that "Dr. Warne objected to the proposition of municipal works as a means of relief, saying that for would mean a check to the body of the household rush of laborers to Europe and would be of no benefit here."

I beg leave to state my position as being heartily in favor of the immediate prosecution of public works as a relief measure for the present critical situation upon the unemployed in New York City. At the same time I also believe that such work should be intelligently safeguarded in such a way as not to check the homeward rush of immigrants now crowding the steamship lines for Europe. If this were done I believe that the undertaking of public works would be of immense benefit and would aid materially in relieving the unemployed situation.

An Incredible Englishman.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Let me, as an Englishman, congratulate Mr. Edward Nicoll Townsend on having achieved the feat of finding new evidence describing the statesmanship of Great Britain. I have heard many and strange charges made against it, but never yet those of baseness and embezzlement.

Better Dodge.

First Office Boy—Going to attend funerals this season?

Second Office Boy—None; I'll ask for afternoons of rest for President.

Higher Still. Egler—Is he a parlor socialist? Inquis—No, drawing room.

LOOKS LIKE AN ARCTIC FAKE.

Mr. W. Steffansson, the ethnologist who returned from the American Arctic last fall, has received letters from Herschel Island, dated January 26 last, which increase the probability that the story of the finding of Captain McClure's wooden exploring vessel, the Investigator, abandoned on the north coast of Banks Land more than half a century ago, is not true.

"One of the despatches from British Columbia," said Mr. Steffansson yesterday, "reported that small vessels had no difficulty in getting alongside the old ship. The fact is that there are only two seagoing vessels in the Arctic north of this continent at the present time, and it is feared that one of them is lost. The whaler, Karluk, Captain Wing, of San Francisco, has been wintering at Herschel Island. The only other vessel in Beaufort Sea was the Olga, a little trading schooner, which was last seen near Herschel Island in September just before a terrible storm came down. Even the stanch whaler was in grave danger for a while, and as the Olga was small and not seaworthy and nothing had been seen or heard of her up to the last week in January, my friends report that it is feared she is lost."

"Another despatch says that the whalers who discovered the old vessel were guarding their prize in the Bay of Mercy on the north coast of Banks Land, the fact being that the only whaler in the north is the Karluk, and she is 500 miles to the southwest of the Bay of Mercy, where McClure abandoned the Investigator. Moreover, the letters I have received from friends at Herschel Island say nothing of the discovery of McClure's famous ship or of the finding of any other derelict or stranded bulk, but they have much to say about the winter life on the only Beaufort Sea whaler, and tell how many polar bears have been seen and shot and how many caribou slaughtered."

"One story says that the ship was discovered floating about and 'all safe,' and some of her provisions were still fit to eat. But Mr. Krabbe of the British ship Resolute, who visited the Investigator on May 5, 1854, and was the last to bring news of her, reported that the ship had leaked so much as to be full with water up to her orlop deck."

"Of course it is conceivable that the Investigator might have been frozen into a huge cake of ice and thus kept afloat; but there are so many weak points in the story that it is difficult to give credence to it."

"As far as I know the nearest whaling vessel ever got to the Bay of Mercy was some forty or fifty miles, and that was the whaler Narwhal, Captain Leavitt, in July, 1907. She saw no sign of the Investigator or of any human being."

"There is just one historic instance of a ship abandoned in the Arctic and picked up later while drifting in free water. This was the British ship Resolute, abandoned by Captain Belcher's orders in Melville Sound in 1854 and found drifting a year or two later in the Atlantic and brought to port by an American whaler."

AMERICAN BEER.

Its Purity and Freedom From Adulterants Defended.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—"H. W. K." asserts that he has been "informed on reliable authority that there are thousands of barrels of imported lager beer sold throughout this country daily because our American brewers, with hardly any exception, will not make beer of a purer quality than that of the 'thousands of barrels of imported lager beer sold throughout this country daily,' an opportunity of making money by brewing 'pure beer' seems to loom large before him, if he had stopped to consult the figures he would have been better informed, and possibly would not have rushed into it."

The path of the question is the line between the authority of the Federal Government under its interstate commerce laws and the authority of States under their police powers.

To the Editor of the Sun:—The developments in the hearings on the Hepburn bill amending the Sherman anti-trust act furnish one more and more. What are you to think of the mental attitude and moral makeup of Professor J. W. Jenks? According to the reports in the papers he has been telling why certain things have been inserted in the bill. For instance, he gave the astonishing information that when a corporation whether the corporation could legally be compelled to divulge certain information... not connected with interstate commerce... a provision had been inserted in the bill allowing the President to refuse their registration unless they furnish such information.

Not less valuable and conclusive is the testimony of Dr. H. W. Wiley, chief of the bureau of chemistry, United States Department of Agriculture, who has done much toward the establishment of a general pure food law in this country. He has testified in the House of Representatives to the purity and high standard of American beer. Senator McCumber, one of the fathers of the Pure Food law, in his report on the bill to the Senate, said: "The brewers of this country are all in favor of this pure food law, and they are satisfied that they manufacture a pure article."

"H. W. K.'s specific attack on corn, as an adulterant, is a gross and unwarranted, his deplorable ignorance of the whole subject more than any other feature of his article. It reads like an article written by a man who has never been informed that our knowledge of brewing need not be informed that our knowledge of rice are regarded as peculiarly desirable as adulterants in that many European countries. As a matter of fact, the brewers of the solitary brewer known to 'H. W. K.' have only malted grain and other cereals with it. When corn is used only the best part, the inside of the grain, free from all hulls, is taken."

Finally, the Agricultural Department of the United States, which is generally charged with the administration of interstate commerce laws, admits corn, rice and wheat as barley adjuncts in brewing. Perhaps I may be allowed to add that the National Brewers' Association, representing practically the entire brewing trade of the country, was organized for the purpose of maintaining the purity of the pure food bill consistently with the administration of interstate commerce laws. M. MONTAGN.

In One Year 400 Executions for Robbery.

ARMED correspondents South China Post.—Rumored robbery is still in the district despite the efforts of the authorities to suppress it. Over four hundred executions of offenders for this crime have taken place in this district alone during the past twelve months.

Play Ball.

Each member of our baseball team, on edge for the season's fray. Counts its position as one supreme. And final test of play: When things look dim the fans on him depend to save the day.

Each player—his work the records tell—A fruitful ball can wield; An action game is his to swell. The stick's productive yield. In him combined sex brains and mind. At clockwork pulse revealed. Cheer, while the band prolongs the din; On edge for the season's marching tune. A coin is tossed, the field we win. Our favorites take the field.

QUESTION FOR THE DEMOCRACY.

Is Bryan to Work the Party's Complete Destruction?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—If Mr. Bryan is the candidate of the Democracy for the Presidency this year and meets the same overwhelming defeat as in 1896 and 1900 the final destruction of the Democracy party will be an accomplished fact.

The Republican party will in 1910 have with the exception of Mr. Cleveland's two terms, in uninterrupted control of national administration for fifty years. During only two years of that entire period has the Democracy party had complete control of all the branches of the national Government. For most of the period the Republican party has been in undisputed control, until to-day we see the Democracy party of the North practically wiped out of existence, while such inroads have been made upon the strength of the party in the South that it has become utterly impotent as a factor in affairs of the nation. Yet the man under whose leadership the party has reached the brink of destruction bids fair to be its nominee for the Presidency again.

The fatuous ignorance by which a party representing six or seven millions of voters can take a step of this nature shakes one's confidence, to say the least, in the efficacy of the party's present leadership. It is hard to be faced that the election this fall of either Mr. Roosevelt or his appointee, Mr. Taft, means the final extinction of an opposition party and the practical permanent installation of the present corrupt and brutalized Republican party.

The depth of degradation to which the Republican party has sunk was recently pointed out by THE SUN in a brilliant and scathing article. The truth of the statement contained therein no honest man can deny. The question is, What are the American people going to do about it? Is it not about time for them to sit up and take notice when they are compelled to choose between a party saturated with corruption and one led by an ignorant and unprincipled mountebank?

Can the people possibly decide themselves with the idea that their government can long be in the case of People vs. Baker, they are restricted to such a choice as they can not realize that this continual "choice between two evils" can only end in disaster to the nation? If the American people are unable to realize this—if they cannot rise to a sense of their real danger and take a hand in the selection of a more honorable and patriotic man on one hand and the deep sea of Bryanism on the other, then the end of government in this country as planned by our forefathers is in sight.

SNEAK DIVORCES.

Unintelligent Courts and Ignorant Litigants Complimented.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Some figures recently compiled by the Bureau of Vital Statistics of South Dakota illustrate in a striking manner the divorce evil in some of our States. It is a fact that in the year 1907 the divorce bill netted for South Dakota upward of \$400,000 derived from the issuance of 622 divorces, of which 320 were to persons not bona fide residents of the State. This sum would pay the salaries of all the State judges and judges of the courts of South Dakota for a period of ten years. It is estimated that in ten years the State of South Dakota