The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 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.

The daily and Sunday SUN is on sale in London at Murray's Exchange, Trafalgar Buildings, Northumberland avenue; Pall Mall American and Colonial Exchange, Carlton street, Regent street, and Daw's Steamship Agency, 17 Green street, Leicester Square.

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.

THE THREAT THAT WINS.

From THE SUN *of March* 11, 1908.

"If they will not take Taft they will have to take Me" is the reported and generally accepted form of the awful ultimatum.

If the current political drama were not tragic in the widespread ruin which has attended its progress so far, it would be a comedy without an equal in the history of the world.

When, outside of opera bouffe, did a Ruler ever threaten his people with a prolongation of his own rule unless they would meekly allow him to dictate the selection of his successor?

Not Entirely "Superfluous."

In the enlightened view of the editor of the *Evening Mail*, and likewise in the deliberate opinion of the editor of the *Globe and Commercial Advertiser*, the undertaking of Dr. BUTLER, Mr. CHOATE and their Republican associate memorialists is as admirable in the academic sense as it is unnecessary as a practical measure. Superfluous, and therefore dangerous, says the eminent Rooseveltian of the *Mail*. It is like the gilding of gold, says the equally eminent Rooseveltian of the *Globe*; why not go further and ask the convention to commend the Ten Commandments?

With a spontaneity of effort that does much credit to his newspaper training, a third Rooseveltian editor, Mr. JOHN EDWARD BRUCE of the Yonkers *Standard*, furnishes in the nick of time a complete answer to the doubts of his distinguished colleagues of the *Mail* and the *Globe*. We commend to those journals the candid utterances of their confrère of Yonkers upon the subject of the superfluousness not of the Butler-Choate resolution, but of the Supreme Court itself. In his eloquent way the Yonkers gentleman illustrates the disesteem into which our judicial establishment has fallen in Administration circles. On the authority of that celebrated philosopher Dr. HARVEY JOHNSON, Mr. BRUCE denounces the judiciary as a nuisance and obstacle to reform, a positive source of weakness in the nation's government. In the matter of accomplishing reforms he finds that the overestimated occupants of the exalted bench stand sometimes in the way of the desires of "the whole people." Shall nine men, asks Mr. BRUCE, "turn down the will of eighty millions of people"? Mr. BRUCE, as a Rooseveltian reformer, perceives the absurdity and inconvenience of the system.

How much more respectable intellectually is the outspoken treatment of the delicate subject by the colored gentleman who presides over the destinies of the *Standard* of Yonkers than are the attempts of the *Globe* and *Evening Mail* to represent the resolution as supererogatory and to exhibit its promoters as well meaning but foolish alarmists! How much more representative and authoritative, we may add, is his position.

Mr. BRUCE, we believe—in no matter how humble a capacity—is actually a member of the Federal Government under the Roosevelt Administration.

We are not informed that either the editor of the *Globe* or the editor of the *Evening Mail* has yet attained to that honor as the reward of political zeal.

About Little Joe Brown.

The next Governor of Georgia is not the dwarf that the Hokesmithites have pictured him. Unofficial measurements make him five feet six. Many leading characters in history have not projected into space as far as that. Mr. BROWN'S opponents seem to have supposed, not incorrectly perhaps, that HOKE SMITH'S impressive height and size were his strongest qualifications for public life. He is Handsome HOKE, too, whereas Little JOE was set down as incurably ugly. Judging from photographs of the two, HOKE looks like a fat variety sketch artist; JOE like a sedate, scholarly and thoughtful schoolmaster or professional man. His chest is said to be narrow, but his forehead is broad, and he has a powerful nose.

Little JOE is a son of old JOE BROWN, Governor and Senator, shrewd, long headed, long winded, who held his own and came into office among elders like STEPHENS, HOWELL COBB and BOB TOOMBS. Little JOE was born in '51, was graduated as first honor man at Oglethorpe University in 1872, studied at a business college, was admitted to the bar in 1873, went to the Harvard law school, but had to give up on account of his eyes. So he took to railroading, beginning as a brakeman and working up to general traffic manager. He was in the railroad business for twenty-two years. No wonder Governor HOKE SMITH kicked him out of the Railroad Commission. However, Little JOE had other irons in the fire. He has to be a farmer, of course. Otherwise how could his heart be really true to the farming interests of Georgia? Even if he has, we regret to say, "a splendid home" at Marietta which used to belong to other statesmen, he redeems his unfortunate birth to the purple and plutocracy by his deep devotion to practical farming and his deep ploughing. It is his pride and boast to have raised sixty-seven bushels of corn and seventy of oats to the acre on his farm in Cherokee county.

"There is nothing of the sport, the society leader or the bravado"—whatever that may be—"about 'Little JOE,'" writes Mr. JOHN CORRIGAN, Jr., in his "Personal History" of this worthy. His voice is deficient in resonance, but he is one of the most accomplished of letter writers. Moreover, he is an author of credit and renown:

> "In 1886 Mr. BROWN wrote and published a history of the Atlanta campaign which was paid the remarkable tribute of being praised by both General JOSEPH E. JOHNSTON and General W. T. SHERMAN as being an accurate and impartial history of that event. On learning that the author had received letters on both sides of this fierce struggle commending the accuracy of the account, General MARCUS J. WRIGHT stated he had never before heard of such a thing in the history of war. Mr. BROWN also wrote a historical romance of the mountains campaign, called 'Kenesaw's Bombardment.'
>
> "In his leisure hours for the past several years Mr. BROWN has been working on a historical romance of America. This was his greatest source of diversion in his hours of relaxation and freedom from routine business cares. The volume was called 'Astyanax' and was issued last year."

The title of this romance shows Mr. BROWN'S classical taste. His literary pursuits were brought up against him in the campaign as evidence of his want of acquaintance with business and his unfitness for public office. Fortunately Georgia is fond of literature, and for it she forgave Mr. BROWN'S want of oratory. It will be seen that Little JOE, if not a sport and "bravado," is a good deal of an "all round man."

Not a Prophecy.

"He interfered with the course of justice as well as with the course of trade, and set up his own crude notions of equity against the law as expounded by the unanimous voice of the gravest Magistrates. It never occurred to him that men whose lives were passed in adjudicating on questions of civil right were more likely to form correct opinions than a prince whose attention was divided among a thousand objects and who had never read a law book through. The resistance opposed to him by the tribunals inflamed him to fury. He reviled his Chancellor. He kicked the shins of his Judges. He did not, it is true, intend to act unjustly. He firmly believed that he was doing right and defending the cause of the poor against the wealthy. Yet this well meant meddling probably did far more harm than all the explosions of his evil passions during the whole of his long reign. We could make shift, indeed, to live under a debauchee or a tyrant, but to be ruled by a busybody is more than human nature can bear."

No, strange as it may seem, this is not a prophecy. It is merely an extract from MACAULAY'S essay on FREDERICK the Great, written long years ago. Queer, isn't it?

Revolt in Oklahoma.

Recently THE SUN directed attention to an effort made by the commercial clubs of Oklahoma to destroy the belief among investors that the new State intends to pursue a "wild eyed" policy in relation to capital. The members of the commercial organizations were unkind enough to express disrespect for the politicians and sensational newspapers that have given a reputation to the State that they assert it does not deserve.

Now the commercial clubs are urging Governor HASKELL to veto an anti-trust bill that is in his hands. As the text of the measure has not been sent East the merits of its provisions are an unknown quantity here. Yet it must be a good bill, for is it not anti-trust? That magic combination of letters in the title of any enactment establishes high desirability. No clause reposing beneath the all embracing sanctity of that label can be other than beneficent.

Perhaps the complaining Oklahomans are tired of too much virtue. Perhaps they are emissaries of the thrice accursed rich. Or it may be—though it seems incredible—that they are merely sane Americans, tired out by the humbug and foolishness of the dishonest campaign against business.

A Rainbow in the Sky.

Governor GLENN of North Carolina is one of the most optimistic, unsuspicious and complacent gentlemen in the entire South. He is fat, placid, roseate. He likes things as they are and can see no flaws in them. He approves of North Carolina's anti-corporation movement, his whole soul goes out to BRYAN and ROOSEVELT. He doesn't know which of these two statesmen he admires most unless it be ROOSEVELT. He would like to see both of them President, and would feel quite safe in the hands of either. When he talks of BRYAN he breaks out all over in a sort of gooseflesh of enthusiasm. BRYAN is the one perfect Democrat; none other need apply for nomination. When he visits Washington and calls at the White House he emerges beaming, wreathed in smiles, full of novel fervor.

He is large about the head, smooth shaven, an image of contentment. Clouds to him are gossamer. With a tornado heading straight for him, and farm houses, assorted citizens and furniture and live stock darkening the air, he would stop to pass the time of day with a neighbor and ask all sorts of questions about his family. Recent portents in Georgia and Alabama have passed him by. He hasn't the faintest idea that anything is changed and that those two roaring blatherskites HOKE SMITH and B. B. COMER have been conspicuously repudiated by the same men who a year or so ago made up an ardent following. He hasn't heard, or doesn't understand, that Arkansas has unloaded JEFF DAVIS; and the bleeding form of BLANCHARD lying in plain view outside the Louisiana breastworks makes about the same impression on his halcyon mind that it would upon a sedate and well conducted Cheshire cheese. Of the disintegrating hysteria in Alabama and the more than definite débâcle in Georgia he is as unconscious as he is of the transit of Venus or the occultation of some ancient Boston postulate. There he stands, serene, rubicund, eternally joyous, the very incarnation of a rainbow.

The North Carolina Senators, OVERMAN and SIMMONS, have declared themselves for sanity. They want to put their party in the way of victory. GLENN appears to have heard nothing about it. Fresh from the atmosphere of the White House charmer, and loaded with acute impressions of his genius, he turns to BRYAN as the next best thing—the only thing, in fact, open to a professing Democrat—and clamors for his nomination at Denver as loudly and as innocently as though nothing had happened in the land since July, 1896. Maybe it is because ROOSEVELT wants it. Perhaps it is. Again it may be that he wishes to be pleasant all around. But there he is and there he will remain.

Governor GLENN is one of the most interesting figures on the stage. He is the picture of good humored, beaming density.

The Encouragement of a Bad Example.

The spectacle of our voluble friend Colonel HENRY WATTERSON seated conspicuously in the Bryan band wagon and proclaiming the issue to be "the case of the people against predatory wealth" will hearten those Democrats who are working against odds to save the party from the fatuity of nominating Mr. BRYAN for President a third time. They have only to quote the Colonel against himself to draw encouragement and satisfaction from his boisterous defection.

Four years ago—to be exact, in February, 1904—the Colonel's friends urged him to make a fight against the Bryan-Hearst combination in Kentucky and procure his own election as a delegate to the national convention at St. Louis, but the Blue Grass State was almost in the grasp of the fond allies, who are strangers now, and the Colonel's heart failed him. In a fit of melancholy he saw Mr. BRYAN dominant in the convention and becoming once more the candidate of a cowed and despairing party. Throwing up the sponge without even entering the ring, the Colonel uttered a wail of despondency:

> "If we are to lose another Presidential election through the agency of Mr. BRYAN, let Mr. BRYAN and his friends carry the whole responsibility. In a word, if the Democratic party has not within itself saving grace to save itself, no individual or newspaper effort will suffice to save it."

In regarding Mr. BRYAN as a sure loser, if nominated, Colonel WATTERSON was quite consistent. Doubtless he believes in the guarded recesses of his inner consciousness, whatever he says for publication, that Mr. BRYAN will be defeated again if named at Denver. In 1896 the Wattersonian heart was stout and undismayed. Who can forget a certain telegram from Geneva in September:

> "Another ticket our only hope. No compromise with dishonor. Stand firm."

And after the rout and ruin of the party he loves, to which he contributed man fashion from a sense of duty, Mr. WATTERSON exclaimed:

> "I hadn't a fear that BRYAN would be elected. His election would have meant revolution, and I felt sure that the American people would follow no man on such a question."

The question was technically the free coinage of silver, but it was contained in the issue (see Mr. BRYAN'S speeches in that campaign) of "the people against predatory wealth." Same issue, same candidate again, according to Colonel WATTERSON. But the Democrats who do not want "to lose another election through the agency of Mr. BRYAN" have not thrown up the sponge and they do not acknowledge heart failure. Reading Colonel WATTERSON'S desertion in the light of previous fulminations against the choice of WILLIAM J. BRYAN as a candidate and the Colonel's triumphant "I told you so," they will be more determined than ever to continue the contest and carry it indomitably to the floor of the convention.

Is Germany a Poor or a Rich Country?

A well known English writer, Mr. J. ELLIS BARKER, author of "Modern Germany," has lately published some statistics showing that Germany is growing richer and Great Britain poorer with every decade, and that already the former can meet better than can the latter most of the tests of national wealth. Mr. BARKER'S data and deductions are corroborated by the latest election manifesto of the German Social Democratic party and by Mr. RICHARD CALWER, the leading German Socialist statistician, who are not likely to exaggerate German prosperity under the existing political and industrial régime.

It is undoubtedly true that a country's principal wealth lies in the people's productive power. Now Germany has 63,000,000 inhabitants against Great Britain's 44,000,000 inhabitants. That is to say, in man power Germany is about 50 per cent. stronger than Great Britain. Not only, moreover, has the former country 50 per cent. more workers than the latter, but her workers are more fully employed. While, according to the most trustworthy statistics and estimates, 5 per cent. of Britain's skilled workers and from 8 to 10 per cent. of her unskilled workers—about 800,000 in all—are permanently out of work, unemployment is practically unknown in the German Empire. The reports of British consuls in German ports show that while Great Britain suffers permanently from a scarcity of work, Germany suffers no less continuously from a scarcity of workers. Then, again, while Britain's population increases by only some 300,000 a year—an increment which is declining—that of Germany grows by more than 900,000. Yet notwithstanding the relatively slow natural increase of Britain's population, between two and three hundred thousand Britons annually emigrate in search of work, while emigration from Germany falls considerably short of the immigration into that country. For every German emigrant to a million inhabitants there are eleven British emigrants.

Another fact brought out by Mr. BARKER is that since 1879 wages in Germany have virtually doubled and are now higher on an average than are wages in Great Britain. In the last named country skilled workers now earn about 35 shillings, or less than $8.50, a week, while the unskilled workers earn only from eleven to twenty shillings ($2.75 to $3.75), from which amount 10 per cent. must be deducted for unemployment. According to Mr. RICHARD CALWER the average yearly earnings of workingmen in the German Empire have risen between 1895 and 1906 by 38 per cent. It is true that during the same period prices have increased by 25 per cent., but the workingmen are from 12 to 13 per cent. better off than they were twelve years ago.

It is plain enough that 63,000,000 fully employed Germans must produce more than 44,000,000 partially employed Englishmen, especially as the former are better organized than the latter and employ the most scientific processes and the most perfect machinery. Unquestionably two British industries, cotton manufacture and shipbuilding, are much larger than the corresponding German ones, but in other industries Germany has attained a far greater predominance. For example, her chemical and electrical industries are the foremost in the world, and in the production of steel she has signally outstripped Great Britain. In 1880 she produced 624,000 tons of steel against Britain's production of 1,342,000 tons; in 1906 Germany could point to 11,135,000 tons of steel against Britain's 6,462,000 tons. Astonishing is the increase of horse-power represented by industrial steam engines in Prussia within about a quarter of a century; in 1879, the total horse-power of such engines was 984,000, whereas in 1907 it was 6,043,567. Even during the seven years between 1900 and 1907 German industrial horse-power increased by 50 per cent.

Another test of national wealth is the amount of money that a given country is able to expend. Now Germany has spent about $250,000,000 on colonies which up to this time have proved almost worthless; she has spent or is spending a similar amount on the redistribution of land in her Polish speaking provinces; she is spending more than $250,000,000 on canals, $100,000,000 yearly on her fleet, and $175,000,000 per annum on workmen's insurance. Even Germany's foreign investments seem to be tending rapidly to vie with those of Great Britain. Ten years ago she derived $300,000,000 a year from that source alone. It is true that money is dear in Germany, but this is because the quickly expanding industries absorb most of the available funds. Germans are able to make 6 per cent. by investing their cash in the national industries.

We venture to say that these statistics are likely to surprise many English speaking persons on both sides of the Atlantic.

The country awaits with due meekness the announcement of the Republican candidate for Vice-President. If it be DOLLIVER, DOLLIVER it will be; and if he should be elected CUMMINS might get into the Senate after all and Republican wounds in Iowa be healed. Would DOLLIVER be regarded on his merits as a very fit person to be President of the United States? Well, DOLLIVER is good natured, good looking in a rural way, and full of voice. Since Mr. ROOSEVELT accepted with great reluctance the job of Vice-President, he ought to understand that it is a first class job for a first class man.

> One of the most alarming tendencies of the time is the alacrity with which Congress appropriates money and the indifference of the people to the large expenditures."—*Representative* GILLETT *of Massachusetts*.

With a President in the White House to whom the public money is no object and who distributes patronage shrewdly among the supporters of his policies, what else could be expected?

> I am not a candidate for chairman of the national committee.—FRANK H. HITCHCOCK.

Young Mr. HITCHCOCK will not know whether he is a candidate or not until he hears from the White House.

Tale of a City Cat.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Here is a tale of a cat in our own little town by name "Ephraim," a lineal descendant of the scouts of Hannibal's army, therefore black and alert. Before he was two he needed but two lessons: that when he saw my door open for his breakfast he should jump on the bed and be covered up, and when the dish was placed in front of the stove and the word "ready" was given he should answer with celerity. When he thinks it time for me to get up up he gets on my chest and looks straight at me until I open my eyes. Another way of waking me is walking around the bed telling me with a very peculiar inflection to his voice that he wants me to arise and dress, and if I am still disobliging he will come close to my face and use a peremptory tone.

He has as many widely different tones to his voice and manner and postures and expressions in his eyes as any human being I ever saw, and commences every tone with a "w" instead of an "m." His memory is wonderful. I taught him by only one application to sit on a chair and wait to have his collar and leash attached and then carry on chair outside the door, and in coming in to repeat the act. I dropped the practice for seven months and on Saturday he took it up again without any leading, running down ahead of me, crying out "Come, come on, I am ready," and surely he was, sitting up in that chair.

He knows my whistle and will come like a flash in response. His tidbits are the stumps of romain and chicory lettuce and a bit of Roquefort cheese. Over the cheese—as much as you could put on a ten cent piece—he smacks his lips like an epicure. I can do and know lots more things, and my sister Rebecca will talk to you right straight along for half an hour or more. She said too much, so we sent her to Orange county to hold converse with the Wallkill Valley birds and sich. EPHRAIM.

MANHATTAN, June 8.

Clearing One of the Forty-three John Davises.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In THE SUN of Sunday there is a story concerning one John Davis, an employee of the New York Racquet and Tennis Club, who it seems is the innocent victim of a communication sent by me to THE SUN on May 18 in which I essayed some criticism of the unsportsmanlike conduct of Eustace H. Miles in accounting for his recent defeats at tennis by Jay Gould.

Believe me I am just as much entitled to the name of John Davis as the gentleman of the Racquet Club. There are forty-three John Davises in Manhattan and The Bronx, and questionable as the honor may seem to some I glory in the fact that I am one of them. I do not want to see the Racquet Club Davis get into trouble or lose his job, so hasten to assume responsibility for the communication. In view of the fact that there were some pugnacious demonstrations toward Mr. Davis over my reference to "bellyaching" English, it is obvious why I do not give my address, as I am a peace loving, docile American. JOHN DAVIS.

NEW YORK, June 8.

Read Good English and Try to Write It.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* THE SUN is noted for the vigor and the purity of its English, and it is therefore natural for one who is anxious to use his pen effectively to go to THE SUN for advice.

Is it a waste of valuable time for a busy man to take a correspondence school course of study in composition and rhetoric in order to atone for past sins of neglect, or is there a more excellent way for a toiler—who is in earnest—to learn the technique of written language? GEORGE I. S. VAUGHN.

NEW YORK, June 8.

IN DEFENCE OF THE JUDICIARY.

Comment on the Petition of the Eighteen Eminent New York Republicans.

From the New York Times.

That is a remarkable memorial which has been addressed to the New York member of the committee on resolutions of the Chicago convention praying that in its platform the convention may say a good word for the courts and refrain from denouncing Judges. The memorial, which is signed by ex-members of the Cabinet, ex-Judges, prominent members of the bar and other gentlemen of "light and leading," is here appended, with the signatures:

> The undersigned Republicans, having in mind the attack upon the courts made by the platform and the candidate of the Democratic party in 1896, and having reason to believe that a similar attack is contemplated in the Presidential campaign of 1908, do earnestly request the committee on resolutions to include in its report to the Republican national convention the following declaration:
>
> We affirm our confidence in the integrity and justice of the courts, State and national, and we insist that the preservation of their independence and full constitutional prerogatives is essential to the maintenance of the American system of government.
>
> JUNE 6, 1908.

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER,	JOSEPH H. CHOATE,
CHARLES ANDREWS,	WILLIAM J. WALLACE,
CORNELIUS N. BLISS,	BENJAMIN F. TRACY,
THOMAS L. JAMES,	JOHN W. GRIGGS,
JOHN L. CADWALADER,	EDMUND WETMORE,
JOHN A. STEWART,	EDWARD MITCHELL,
D. O. MILLS,	A. BARTON HEPBURN,
WILLIAM N. COHEN,	RUSH RHEES,
JAMES M. TAYLOR,	ALBERT K. SMILEY.

The emotions with which this document has been read in the White House may be imagined. It is true that the Bryan convention of 1896 did speak of the court in terms which to the judicious seemed disrespectful. There is some warrant for the present memorial in this plank from Mr. Bryan's first platform:

> We denounce arbitrary interference by Federal authorities in local affairs as a violation of the Constitution of the United States and a crime against free institutions, and we especially object to government by injunction as a new and highly dangerous form of oppression by which Federal Judges, in contempt of the laws of the States and rights of citizens, become at once legislators, Judges and executioners; and we approve the bill passed in the last session of the United States Senate and now pending in the House of Representatives relative to contempts in Federal courts and providing for trials by jury in certain cases of contempt.

But was it the fear that this attack upon the courts made twelve years ago might be repeated by the Democrats this year that moved these memorialists to address the convention? Were they thinking of Denver or of Chicago? President Roosevelt, as the public well remembers, has upon occasion somewhat freely spoken his mind about the courts. He was cold and critical in his comments upon one of the decisions in the beef trust cases. In his message of January 31 last, referring to the injunction process when employed to restrain acts of violence in labor strikes, he said:

> But there is no question in my mind that it has sometimes been used heedlessly and unjustly and that some of the injunctions issued inflict grave and occasionally irreparable wrong upon those enjoined. It is indefensible for men to be enjoined from peacefully soliciting others to join a labor union or under any ordinary circumstances from withdrawing from the service of any employer in a controversy arising in good faith as to the terms of their employment.

In the same message he declared that a Judge who "by misuse of the process of injunction or by his attitude toward all measures for the betterment of the conditions of labor makes the wage worker feel with bitterness that the courts are hostile to him, or who fails to realize that all public servants in their several stations must strive to stop the abuses of the criminal rich—such a man performs an even worse service to the body politic than the legislator or Executive who goes wrong."

That confidence which the memorialists say they feel "in the integrity of the justice of the courts, State and national" is not felt in equal degree by the President. He is full of distrust of the courts on their equity side. In England and in this country it has been felt for some hundreds of years that the power of the injunction process might be vested in the courts without fear that, as the President puts it, it would be "used heedlessly and unjustly." Mr. Roosevelt would take away the Chancellor's pen, or at least would prescribe within rigid limits how he should use it in affixing his signature to orders. He has so often appealed to Congress to modify the injunction power and his authority over the convention proceedings is presumably so great that but for this memorial something about injunctions would very likely have found its way into the platform. It remains to be seen whether the petition of these eminent and respectable Republicans will be thrown into the waste basket.

Hands Off the Courts!

From the New York Evening Post.

"Hands off the judiciary!" is an admirable appeal at any time. It is particularly fitting that just at this juncture representative men like Joseph H. Choate, A. B. Hepburn, ex-Chief Justice Andrews, ex-Secretary Tracy and Mr. McKinley's Attorney-General, John W. Griggs, should petition the Republican party to include in its platform the following declaration:

> We affirm our confidence in the integrity and justice of the courts, State and national, and we insist that the preservation of their independence and full constitutional prerogatives is essential to the maintenance of the American system of government.

That sounds as if it had been written in 1896, when the Republican party was aghast at Bryan's attack on the courts. Times have changed, and not in any respect more than in the attitude of McKinley's successor toward Judges. Such a plank as is suggested would make, it seems to us, excellent campaign reading and be extremely useful to the party in holding to it men who are repelled by the radicalism of to-day. But the signers of the petition must not deceive themselves on two points: Petitions of this kind will receive little or no attention from a personally conducted affair like the Chicago convention; and, disguise it as they may, their appeal is nothing else than a dissent, not merely from Bryan but also from Roosevelt policies. As the despatches already report, the petition finds the White House very cool toward it.

A Real Issue at Chicago.

From the New York Commercial.

It will not, because it cannot, be denied that the names of the eighteen Republican lawyers, business men, former Cabinet officers, ex-Judges, public educators and so forth attached to the memorial requesting the Republican national convention to declare in its platform squarely and unequivocally against any infringement on the constitutional prerogatives of the courts lend to that instrument dignity, an importance and a weight that must compel at least its deliberate and thoughtful consideration by the committee on resolutions, if not its instant adoption; for it is unthinkable that any delegate to this convention or any of the aspirants to its nomination honors can seriously project the slightest objection to the declaration either on ethical or logical or political grounds or from the point of view of party expediency. The memorial is a model of conciseness and force of statement.

If only it were possible and in order for the New York State delegation of seventy-two members—an absolutely uninstructed, hand free, foot free delegation—to take this instrument along to Chicago and present it to the convention as an expression of popular Republican opinion in New York, what a prestige it would give the State in the national gathering and how certain in advance would be the unanimous adoption of the plank both by the platform committee and the convention itself! As it is, this delegation will move forward to the national convention bearing what is almost everywhere conceded to be a forlorn hope Presidential "boom"—that of Charles Evans Hughes, Governor—and with not a few of its members declining to share in the burden, so that New York State will be handicapped in the gathering from the very outset by the embarrassment always attaching to a "split" delegation; and any activities that the delegation might engage in with reference to this memorial would run the risk of being interpreted by the supporters of other aspirants to the nomination as a part of the Hughes "outfit" for advancing his cause. In consequence the delegation will be practically barred from actively backing the memorial so long as Candidate Hughes's name is before the convention.

As to the memorial itself, whether its request be granted or not, it presents an alarmingly pregnant fact when it states that its signers have "reason to believe" that an attack similar to that made on the courts by the Democratic platform and candidate in 1896 "is contemplated in the Presidential campaign of 1908." This does not mean only that the Democracy may possibly repeat this year its "past performance" of twelve years ago, but that such an assault may come from other quarters even, for Gompers is preparing to marshal his labor hosts against all candidates who stand for the absolute protection of the courts' prerogatives, and there is consequent danger that Republican candidates for Congress—and there will be very many of them in the Chicago convention—might favor platform silence on this subject or else a declaration so mild and "conservative" as to be susceptible of interpretation as a "straddle."

But if ever the Republican party is moved to "seesaw" on an issue like this it will be worthy of the defeat that it would invite.

THE DISTURBING ELEMENT IN CENTRAL AMERICA.

WASHINGTON, June 9.—A year ago President Zelaya of Nicaragua was regarded and reported as the particularly disturbing element in the affairs of Central America. It is to Mr. Zelaya's credit that he has since retired from that unenviable position, and it is not to the credit of President Cabrera of Guatemala that he has taken the place vacated by Mr. Zelaya.

Salvador is having a little domestic trouble, but it has not yet assumed and perhaps will not assume alarming proportions. General Alfaro, an experienced revolutionist, has no doubt that he would make a better President of Salvador than Figueroa, the present incumbent, and will not stick at revolution to support his opinion if he can secure a sufficient following. There is no reason for belief that Salvadorean affairs would be materially benefited by such an experience or by a change of administration effected by revolt. Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Honduras display no signs of disorder. Guatemala is just now the Central American storm centre, and in that country the political clouds are dark and threatening.

A considerable part of the news about Guatemala, and even much that comes directly from Guatemala, must be discounted. The stories told by Cabrera's friends are perhaps no more accurate than are the tales told by his enemies. The latter tell of his fierce brutality, of hundreds of summary executions for political offences, of property seized and of the imprisonment of both men and women. They tell of both voluntary and enforced exile for hundreds, including many families of social prominence. The friends of Mr. Cabrera enter denial of these statements or urge justification for the acts. The fact seems to be that Cabrera, who for a number of years conducted a very creditable government, has lost control of himself and of the situation. Opposition appears to have excited him to a course which by its severity has extended and strengthened the antagonism.

It is evident that Mr. Cabrera has disregarded the article in the Guatemalan Constitution which declares that "the judicial power is vested in the Judges and tribunals of the republic, to whom the right belongs exclusively of applying the laws in all cases, civil and criminal," and has essayed government by Presidential decree. Every summary execution, every man exiled, every seizure of property as punishment for actual or suspected political offences has made for him new enemies to be shot or exiled or deprived of property.

A statesman with wisdom far beyond that displayed by Mr. Cabrera might devise a plan for the retrieval of disordered fortunes. As the Guatemala matter stands it is difficult to see anything except continual trouble until the close of Cabrera's administration, in 1911, unless it might be his assassination or his overthrow by revolution.

Our Purchases From Abroad.

Except in the case of Canada our imports from each principal country decreased in the ten months ended April, 1908, as compared with the ten months ended April, 1907. Here are the figures as analyzed from a bureau of statistics monthly report:

	Ten months, April, 1908.	*Decreases.*
Great Britain	$164,364,596	$42,628,417
Germany	121,978,179	12,497,623
France	90,482,302	19,255,695
Brazil	62,241,304	23,561,021
Japan	59,202,160	2,090,573
Cuba	64,190,509	9,069,336
Mexico	38,972,141	7,800,840
Chinese Empire	22,938,255	5,729,438
Netherlands	17,474,836	9,017,888
Total imports	$1,018,802,309	$177,096,795

From Canada we imported $63,472,966 worth of goods, an increase of $4,257,642.

The $177,000,000 decrease consisted of: Crude foodstuffs and food animals, $4,000,000; foodstuffs wholly or partly manufactured, $11,000,000; crude materials for use in manufacturing, $93,000,000; manufactures for remanufacturing, $57,000,000; manufactures ready for consumption, $12,000,000.

Painter's Faithful Servant.

From Reynolds's Newspaper.

Sir Edwin Landseer, the famous animal painter, had an old servant—his butler, valet and faithful slave—named William, who was particularly assiduous in guarding the outer portal; no one could by any possibility gain direct access to Sir Edwin. The answer would invariably be, "Sir Hedwin is not at 'ome." The Prince Consort himself once received this answer when he called, amplified on that occasion by the assurance that "he had gone to a wedding," an entire fiction on William's part, as the Prince found out, for on walking boldly in and around the garden he noticed Sir Edwin looking out of his studio window. This was the faithful attendant who one day when a lion had died at "the Zoo" and his corpse came up in a four wheel cab to be painted from startled his master with the question, "Please, Sir Edwin, did you horder a lion?"

Rearrangement of the Stars.

From the Kennebec Journal.

It may be interesting to know that a Maine man suggested the new arrangement for the stars in the United States flag which will become effective on July 4. With the admission of Oklahoma it became necessary to place a new star in the blue field of the flag. This necessitated a rearrangement of the stars. Charles A. Tallman, U. S. N., retired, of Richmond, made a sixteen inch flag in which he made the arrangement and forwarded it to the State Department as a suggestion. The State Department referred the matter to the Navy Department, for that Department has charge of the flag. A few days later Mr. Tallman received a letter from the Department informing him that his arrangement was the one which the Department had had under consideration. Since then it has been officially announced as the arrangement of the stars.

Wanted—a Chauffeur.

"Wanted—a chauffeur, both sober and neat
And able to clean and repair,
And when he's not driving to wait on the door,
And manage the pony with care.
He must sleep in the stable, and take his meals out,
The chickens and pigs he must feed,
And keep all the lawn and the grass borders mowed,
And the garden he also must weed.

"He must work every Sunday, and clean all the boots,
He must milk and attend to the cow,
And put up the clotheslines and beat out the rugs,
And to polish the windows know how.
For duties like these the munificent sum
Of ten dollars a week he will get"—
The woman or man who inserted this ad.
Is in want of a chauffeur as yet.

MINNA IRVING.

TIRED OF THE SUPREME COURT.

An Illuminating and Significant Letter Which We Print With Pleasure.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I take it that THE SUN is big enough and broad enough to hear both sides of any question in which it is interested, and in this belief I am addressing this communication to you for publication. I have read with much interest your editorial in to-day's SUN and the opinions of eminent and distinguished gentlemen favoring the proposition to incorporate a plank in the next Republican platform frowning upon Federal interference with the courts. I notice that nearly if not all the gentlemen who are opposed to what they call Federal interference with the courts are directly or remotely identified with interests which have been able to defy the majesty of the law and to do about as they pleased when called to account by the courts.

Speaking of the unlimited powers and great latitude of the Supreme Court, which is the creature of the Executive and therefore not greater than its creator, Dr. Harvey Johnson, a well known author, observes, and I think with great truth, that: "We might point out another source of weakness in the nation's government. It is the judiciary, with its powers, discretions and privileges, which are so great that it might appropriately be called the organized aristocracy of the country, or a government within the government, with powers far exceeding those of the other or general Government."

At a casual glance this assertion may seem absurd, but on careful examination it will be found to be too true, for in many respects it is an absolute power, differing very little from an absolute monarchy, and every member is a monocrat with more or less absolute powers and functions of office. And not only so, but the Supreme Bench of the judiciary is infallible, for in the eyes and light of the Constitution it never makes a mistake, neither can its acts be retrieved, no matter how obnoxious the people may consider them and know them to be. And this makes the Supreme Court of the nation superior to the nation, for, as I have said, the nation itself cannot call in question any decision the court makes. The people, the whole people, may through the Congress enact any law they choose, and they may desire it to go into effect ever so much after it is enacted, but if the Supreme Court does not like it the people cannot have it, no matter how much they may want it. Now, what is the fact just here made plain? It is that nine men have the constitutional right conferred upon them to turn down the will of eighty millions of people and they are absolutely powerless to help themselves. And yet this nation calls itself an independent sovereign people. But where is the sovereignty of, in or among the people when the people have by constitutional enactment given it away or conferred supremacy upon nine men of its number called a court?

No, there is no independence or sovereignty with the people, for they are irrevocably tied hand and foot by any and every act of the Supreme Court, and indeed so broad and unlimited are the powers and functions of the court that it is the real law making power in this country after all, for it has both the power of construction and destruction, and it is unlimited and unreviewable, so they can enlarge or restrict any and every law that Congress makes and thus make the law another law or no law at all, and this last is done simply by the use of one phrase, and that phrase is "This law is unconstitutional." When that is said all that pertained to that law, though it contained the best brain work in the land, all is "done for"—it is knocked out and counts for naught, and that forever so far as the people's power to remedy it is concerned.

I do not think or believe that the Republican convention soon to convene in Chicago should go on record in favor of this measure. It is a "live wire" and can only safely be handled by the best judicial minds in the country. It conceals more than it reveals, and therefore should be avoided by politicians whose business is to make Presidents.

JOHN EDWARD BRUCE,
Editor the Yonkers *Standard*.

YONKERS, N. Y., June 8.

METEOR CRATER.

To Whom the Credit of Explaining the Natural Wonder Belongs.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* There seems to be a growing impression that the United States Government (through Dr. Merrill) is conducting the explorations at Meteor Crater and is entitled to the credit of the wonderful discovery which Mr. B. C. Tilghman of Philadelphia and I were privileged to make several years ago. We were the first to explain to the scientific world the origin of the great crater, the United State Geological Survey having previously considered that it was due to a steam explosion.

We were the first to state in an accredited scientific journal that the crater could not have been produced by geological agencies, and could have been produced only by the impact of a great meteor. In our papers published over two years ago we carefully set forth our reasons for this conclusion. See *Proceedings* of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, December, 1905 (issued March, 1906), and the previous brief announcement by its president, Dr. Dixon, of the discovery.

Incidentally I may add that the United States Government does not own the land covered by the crater, having some time previously issued a patent for the same to us and our associates; also that neither the Government nor any one else has spent a dollar in these explorations without which the scientific world could not have been absolutely assured of the correctness of the conclusions set forth by Mr. Tilghman and myself in the above mentioned papers.

In correction of a statement made by THE SUN of May 20 let me say that we have never sold a pound of meteoric specimens since we came into possession of the property. There are, however, at the present time many specimens from here on loan at the United States National Museum at Washington. These are of unusual scientific interest. We propose leaving one-half of them permanently with the museum.

DANIEL MOREAU BARRINGER.

SUNSHINE STATION, Ariz., June 4.

John Kean Proposed for Vice-President.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* As the selection of a Western man for President on the Republican ticket seems to be assured, the nomination for Vice-President of a Jerseyman is among the possibilities.

I would suggest the name of a man of large business interests, one who thoroughly understands the needs of the country and has done more to place New Jersey in the Republican column and keep it there than any other man or set of men in the State. I refer to the Hon. John Kean of Ursino.

ELIZABETH, N. J., June 8. A BUSINESS MAN.

The Wild Huntsman.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Is the Mightiest Huntsman to be deprived of his quest for big game in Africa after March 4, 1909?

Will he—albeit against his will—have bagged bigger game at home?

All his admirers—and who is not his admirer?—have placid confidence that the M. H. will be stalking the game that he prefers, then as now.

ALEXANDRIA, Va., June 8. W. R. C.

Tennessee's Stingiest Man.

From the Danville Advocate.

Gallatin claims to have the stingiest man in Tennessee, if not in the world, and a premium is offered for his superior in closefistedness. He got married to a home girl to save expenses. They walked around the square for a bridal tour. He bought her a nickel's worth of stick candy for a wedding present and then suggested that they save the candy for the children.

Interpreted.

Mrs. Knicker—The baby is crying for the moon.

Knicker—Give it to him, my dear; it is the will of the people.