

The Sun

THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 1909.

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

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid. DAILY, Per Month, \$1.00. DAILY, Per Year, \$10.00.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.

London office, 11, Abchurch Lane, E.C. 4. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, Carlton street, Regent street.

Paris office, 22 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'Opera, and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Halles, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

Our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication will be glad to have them returned, if they wish, in all cases and stamps for that purpose.

The First Draft of the Tariff Bill.

Whatever delight or dole the tariff bill may give to those whom it helps or hurts or leaves alone, they and the rest of us must keep in mind that it is only a proposition, to be discussed, amended, cut, patched, made over, according to the necessities of revenue and politics, the "pull" of various industries and sections, combinations and compromises of many sorts.

Here we have a characteristic picture of the young champion sustaining the brunt of the argument before the Governor, unaided in the presentation of the case except by five or six battered looking foreigners. We now reproduce a contemporary newspaper report, from the Albany Argus of March 9, 1883:

The Governor gave a hearing yesterday on the bill to prohibit the manufacture of cigars in tenement houses. The Hon. Rufus W. Packard and Morris S. Wess represented the opposition and Senators Grady and Fitzgerald and Assemblymen Rosesch and Roosevelt appeared in support of the bill.

Mr. Roosevelt continues: I answered various questions which the Governor put to me. He afterward called me up and told me that, though he felt very doubtful, in view of the state of facts I had set forth he would sign the bill.

The fact is that a day or two after the hearing Governor (CLEVELAND) sent for Assemblyman ROESCH, who had introduced the bill, and told him he feared the law would be declared unconstitutional on account of its first section being at variance with the title.

Mr. ROESCH asked for time to consult with the labor leaders. They declined to consent to a recall, and on Mr. ROESCH'S plea to the Governor the bill was signed.

Again Mr. ROOSEVELT: The employers and tenement house owners immediately contested the constitutionality of the act, and after the usual long delays the highest State court finally pronounced the measure invalid.

We now come to the most flagrant misrepresentation of all, that by which Mr. ROOSEVELT attempts to create the belief that the unanimous decision of the exalted court was rendered on a "hair-splitting refinement" of construction.

The statement that the measure was declared invalid "after the usual long delays" is not borne out by the chronology of the record. The relator, PAUL, was arrested in August, 1883, the writ of habeas corpus he obtained was dismissed in October, argument was heard in the Court of Appeals on January 6, and the decision was rendered by Judge FINCH, all concurring, on January 29, 1884—less than six months from beginning to conclusion.

We have read the article referred to by Mr. DUBBELL. The "judicial experience" related by Mr. ROOSEVELT was manifestly intended by him to produce on immature or restless intellects precisely the impression which our correspondent says it has produced upon his intellect: disgust with the bench, impatience with the law and its orderly processes, and the general idea that by forced and technical constructions many of our Judges have the habit of defeating what is morally right and promoting what is wrong.

The circumstance that the highest court of the Empire State did not agree with the opinions entertained by Mr. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, at the age of twenty-five, as to what is constitutional and what unconstitutional in the matter of tenement house legislation appears to have rankled in his mind, for twenty-six years and until the present day. He seems unable to forget the remotest and smallest event that ever wounded his self-esteem.

For the information of Mr. DUBBELL and others we proceed to compare Mr. ROOSEVELT'S version of this "judicial experience" with the truths of fact and record.

After recounting the demands of the labor unions during the session of 1883 legislation "to stop the manufacture of cigars in tenement houses," and expressing the opinion that he was put on the investigating committee with the idea that he would help to kill the measure "on account of my education and social surroundings," he says:

ROESCH of the Municipal Court. It was not drawn by him, although he seems to have supported it loyally. Mr. ROOSEVELT'S statements that the labor leaders had no money to employ counsel to present their case and that no lawyer of note had been consulted are untrue. The author of the bill introduced by Mr. ROESCH was ADOLPH STRASSER, then president of the Cigar Makers International Union. EDWARD C. KLINK, former president of the Buffalo Cigar Makers Union, who was present at the hearing before Governor CLEVELAND, is authority for the statement that STRASSER "spent a lot of money in pushing the bill, and for one thing paid ROSCOE CONKLING \$5,000 as a retainer. CONKLING told STRASSER that the bill even if enacted would be set aside as unconstitutional." Later the labor leaders were represented on appeal by the late Judge SAMUEL HAND of Albany, a distinguished jurist and an able and experienced counsel practicing before the Court of Appeals.

Mr. ROOSEVELT continues: "When it (the bill) passed both houses, the then Governor, GROVER CLEVELAND, appointed a day for a hearing, and the labor unions asked me to appear. As I had several good counsel being retained by the other side there were, besides myself, merely five or six representatives of the Cigar Makers Union, all of them foreigners—battered looking men with whom the battle of life had gone hard. As this was long before I had established any real relations with or had any real understanding of the unions, while they felt that I was a crank, influenced by incomprehensible motives, we worked on entirely independent lines, neither side feeling altogether comfortable in the relationship. However, the main argument—and indeed almost the only argument—for the bill was made by me."

Here we have a characteristic picture of the young champion sustaining the brunt of the argument before the Governor, unaided in the presentation of the case except by five or six battered looking foreigners. We now reproduce a contemporary newspaper report, from the Albany Argus of March 9, 1883:

The Governor gave a hearing yesterday on the bill to prohibit the manufacture of cigars in tenement houses. The Hon. Rufus W. Packard and Morris S. Wess represented the opposition and Senators Grady and Fitzgerald and Assemblymen Rosesch and Roosevelt appeared in support of the bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT continues: I answered various questions which the Governor put to me. He afterward called me up and told me that, though he felt very doubtful, in view of the state of facts I had set forth he would sign the bill.

The fact is that a day or two after the hearing Governor (CLEVELAND) sent for Assemblyman ROESCH, who had introduced the bill, and told him he feared the law would be declared unconstitutional on account of its first section being at variance with the title.

Mr. ROESCH asked for time to consult with the labor leaders. They declined to consent to a recall, and on Mr. ROESCH'S plea to the Governor the bill was signed.

Again Mr. ROOSEVELT: The employers and tenement house owners immediately contested the constitutionality of the act, and after the usual long delays the highest State court finally pronounced the measure invalid.

We now come to the most flagrant misrepresentation of all, that by which Mr. ROOSEVELT attempts to create the belief that the unanimous decision of the exalted court was rendered on a "hair-splitting refinement" of construction.

The statement that the measure was declared invalid "after the usual long delays" is not borne out by the chronology of the record. The relator, PAUL, was arrested in August, 1883, the writ of habeas corpus he obtained was dismissed in October, argument was heard in the Court of Appeals on January 6, and the decision was rendered by Judge FINCH, all concurring, on January 29, 1884—less than six months from beginning to conclusion.

We have read the article referred to by Mr. DUBBELL. The "judicial experience" related by Mr. ROOSEVELT was manifestly intended by him to produce on immature or restless intellects precisely the impression which our correspondent says it has produced upon his intellect: disgust with the bench, impatience with the law and its orderly processes, and the general idea that by forced and technical constructions many of our Judges have the habit of defeating what is morally right and promoting what is wrong.

The circumstance that the highest court of the Empire State did not agree with the opinions entertained by Mr. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, at the age of twenty-five, as to what is constitutional and what unconstitutional in the matter of tenement house legislation appears to have rankled in his mind, for twenty-six years and until the present day. He seems unable to forget the remotest and smallest event that ever wounded his self-esteem.

For the information of Mr. DUBBELL and others we proceed to compare Mr. ROOSEVELT'S version of this "judicial experience" with the truths of fact and record.

After recounting the demands of the labor unions during the session of 1883 legislation "to stop the manufacture of cigars in tenement houses," and expressing the opinion that he was put on the investigating committee with the idea that he would help to kill the measure "on account of my education and social surroundings," he says:

limited and specific title confined entirely to tenement houses, a class of buildings known to and defined by law, erected as a fraud and deception upon the people of the city. . . . The constitutional provision deals with the law itself as it came from the Legislature. We cannot change and narrow its terms to save it. In the room of the subject plainly stated we cannot put one narrower and different in order to get it within the title. The section must stand or fall just as it was enacted. . . . Such title not only failed to express the subject of the section but by its frame and phrase expressly and affirmatively excluded that subject, for when it professed to relate to tenement houses it substantially declared that it did not relate to dwelling houses generally, which was precisely the one subject to which it did relate. When the title thus deviates and misleads the constitutional provision should apply to it if it is ever to be enforced.

Mr. ROOSEVELT asserts that in consequence of this decision the reformation of tenement house conditions was delayed "for fifteen or twenty years." The truth is that the very next year a new bill was so drawn as to avoid the constitutional objections which had prevailed in the case of the Roesch bill. This new measure was introduced in 1884 and enacted. It went, like its predecessor, to the Court of Appeals in the Matter of JACOBS. This law too was declared unconstitutional in a unanimous opinion delivered by Judge EARL. The decision was rendered on the broad grounds here cogently stated:

When a health law is challenged in the courts as unconstitutional on the ground that it arbitrarily interferes with personal liberty and private property without the due process of law the courts must be able to see that it has at least in part some relation to the public health, that the public health is actually aimed at and that it is appropriate and adapted to that end. This we have not been able to see in this law, and we must therefore pronounce it unconstitutional and void.

In reaching this conclusion we have not been unaided that the power which the courts possess to condemn legislative acts which are in conflict with the supreme law should be exercised with great caution, and even with extreme reluctance. But as said by Chancellor KENT (11 Conn. 450), "It is only by the free exercise of this power that the courts of justice are enabled to repel assaults and to protect every part of the Government and every member of the community from undue and destructive innovations upon their charter rights."

It has been our somewhat unpleasant duty to rebuke the excellent Dr. MABIE for his unworthy lapses and laches in the matter of literary revision. This is more serious business. While the fault may be Dr. MABIE'S for the solecisms, vulgarisms and inanities of style which distinguish the writings of the Outlook's New Contributor from the other contents of that estimable periodical, it would be unfair to hold him responsible for the graver offences we have been exhibiting. These offences are against good and honest journalism.

We are therefore compelled to address the foregoing remarks to Dr. LYMAN ABBOTT himself. He may not be the master of the blue pencil that Dr. MABIE is in dealing with the small sins of literary composition; but let that pass. Dr. LYMAN ABBOTT knows the importance of truthfulness. He understands how indispensable are sobriety of judgment and candor of attitude toward the reader. "Nobody is better able to detect the insidious immorality of purpose which seeks by misstatement and perversions and suppressions of fact to influence public sentiment against our courts of law."

Dr. LYMAN ABBOTT knows all these things, for he is continually preaching them. Yet he allows the Outlook to be made the instrument of the most shameful enterprise of which demagoguery is capable: the deliberate attempt to undermine public confidence in government by law and in the constituted tribunals of law.

The Majority nomination presented to the Hon. MARTIN SAXE by the Lighterage Association does not, as trust, make him the water wagon candidate.

Then something may be done at the extra session after all. In the interest of fair play as well as for the sake of true reform we trust that the six Vassar girls who visited Albany to collect information regarding direct nominations were permitted to see Colonel GEORGE CURTIS TREADWELL, Governor HUGHES'S efficient military secretary, after they had talked with Speaker WARDWORTH. Otherwise we fear a battle for the right has been lost at Vassar.

There will be a little cheer as there is inebriation in the cup if a tax of eight cents a pound is put upon tea.

Present at a midnight conference at the Executive Mansion to-night are Governor HUGHES, ROBERT H. FULLER, his secretary, who is something of an expert primary and election lawyer; C. C. ALDEN, the Governor's counsel, and Senator HARVEY HINMAN, who will introduce the bill in the upper house. . . . About 7 o'clock.

What a large chorus for so small a company! The retirement of a mutinous sergeant of the Rural Guard to the "bush" in Santa Clara with some congenial spirits need not be regarded seriously. Unless the Guard has lost touch with discipline since American army officers consent to train it the insurgents will soon be shot down or brought in.

A Fortunate Firm. To the Editor of The Sun:—Can you admit, Freeborns & Rich, Randolph, N. Y., dealers in hardware and coal? W. A. M. OSWEGO, March 16.

Jack the Giant Killer boasted of his invisible coat. "My wife can't give life to a tramp," he said.

The Suburban Breakfast Table. Coffee cup and roll in hand. And fifty seconds later. Father breakfasts on the run To catch the 708.

Nibbling at a soft boiled egg. And hooding night and main. Mother breakfasts as she leads. To catch the shoppers' train.

Carrying his bowl of mush. And double quickening far. The mother reverses the roles. To catch the high school car.

HARVEY D. at home. In fact we hold it one of the most convincing proofs of the sagacity of that statesman that he should consistently and conspicuously practise reform at Albany and organize politics in Binghamton; for, despite the proverb, in such disunion is strength.

For the peace of mind of a few of our older friends, statesmen emeriti, who now gather in club corners to gossip about ancient landmarks and outdoor customs, we hasten to make a further announcement. We think we can hear their chirps and croaks of ridicule and indignation that the heir apparent of that genial statesman though rigid partisan Colonel GEORGE W. DUNN should be an avowed reformer. We recognize their mournful protest at this invasion of an ancient seat of brimstone Bourbonism. Therefore we hasten to present this crumb of comfort: All is not real reform that advertises, and a moral issue is often a very politician's best asset. When they perceive the commanding figure of the Pride of Pitcher in the forefront of the direct nominations host, we counsel our friends to recall to what humiliating straits ancient organization necessities once reduced them, and to keep in mind the pregnant saying:

"Thrice is he armed who hath his reform just. But four times he who gets to reform just."

The Crime of the Twenty-two. Can a Democrat have a sense of humor? Probably not, at least in times recent and present, or Dollar BILL BRYAN wouldn't have batted so long on the grand old "come on" party. Now here are many or most of the Democratic papers, Dollar and anti-Dollar, looking with reproachful eyes on the private Twenty-two, the Democrats from BARTLETT to SPARKMAN, and including even such select spirits as our old friend the Hon. GRIM JIGGS and LEONIDAS LIVINGSTON, once the light of the Georgia Farmers Alliance. These wretches have "betrayed reform," sold and signed away their souls in Democratic blood to old MEPHISTOPHILUS of Danville; and so the heavyweight Missouri cherub, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK, has been left in the lurch, liberty stabbed, and the rank Egyptian monarch is sneering from his more firmly established throne.

We needn't mention the rewards of some of the traitors. One man gets a place on a committee; one is supposed to have made terms for the protection of the industries of his State, and so on, each of the treacherous twenty-two being supposed to look out for his district or State.

And what were the "insurgents" after? More power for themselves, a better chance to get their bills through. What were CHAMP CLARK and his Laconian patriots after? The same, with the additional boon of disorganizing the Republicans. And what were the magazine thunderers against "Cannonism" after? More circulation and influence, a demonstration that they are not megalomaniacal ignoramus but forces to be dreaded and obeyed by politicians who know what is good for them.

Everybody was manœuvring for something. The man of sin with his Democratic confederates won. Why make ridiculous tears and pretend that only the antijosephite Democrats were good and true? If the Democrats were any sense of humor they would laugh at the ease with which they have allowed themselves to be exploited by the magazine megalomaniacs.

Yet we would not withdraw from censure FITZGERALD, the little Brooklyn Machiavel, who has mastered Cushing and Hinds and all the parliamentarians. FITZGERALD must have done this just to spite CHAMP CLARK. Besides, is not a Democrat who is guilty of knowledge and ability thereby a traitor to Dollar BILL?

The Majority nomination presented to the Hon. MARTIN SAXE by the Lighterage Association does not, as trust, make him the water wagon candidate.

Then something may be done at the extra session after all. In the interest of fair play as well as for the sake of true reform we trust that the six Vassar girls who visited Albany to collect information regarding direct nominations were permitted to see Colonel GEORGE CURTIS TREADWELL, Governor HUGHES'S efficient military secretary, after they had talked with Speaker WARDWORTH. Otherwise we fear a battle for the right has been lost at Vassar.

There will be a little cheer as there is inebriation in the cup if a tax of eight cents a pound is put upon tea.

Present at a midnight conference at the Executive Mansion to-night are Governor HUGHES, ROBERT H. FULLER, his secretary, who is something of an expert primary and election lawyer; C. C. ALDEN, the Governor's counsel, and Senator HARVEY HINMAN, who will introduce the bill in the upper house. . . . About 7 o'clock.

What a large chorus for so small a company! The retirement of a mutinous sergeant of the Rural Guard to the "bush" in Santa Clara with some congenial spirits need not be regarded seriously. Unless the Guard has lost touch with discipline since American army officers consent to train it the insurgents will soon be shot down or brought in.

A Fortunate Firm. To the Editor of The Sun:—Can you admit, Freeborns & Rich, Randolph, N. Y., dealers in hardware and coal? W. A. M. OSWEGO, March 16.

Jack the Giant Killer boasted of his invisible coat. "My wife can't give life to a tramp," he said.

The Suburban Breakfast Table. Coffee cup and roll in hand. And fifty seconds later. Father breakfasts on the run To catch the 708.

Nibbling at a soft boiled egg. And hooding night and main. Mother breakfasts as she leads. To catch the shoppers' train.

Carrying his bowl of mush. And double quickening far. The mother reverses the roles. To catch the high school car.

Thus for suburbs it would seem. The mother reverses the roles. No breakfast tables will be found. On which to lay a tax.

TRADE WITH OUR NON-CON-TIGUIOUS TERRITORY.

WASHINGTON, March 17.—The merchandise shipments of the United States to its non-contiguous territories during the last six years have amounted to a total of about \$20,000,000 in value. The imports from those countries during the same time show a value of about \$45,000,000. Annual exports to these countries are reported thus for calendar years:

Table with columns: Year, Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, Philippines. Data for 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909.

If economic progress is measurable in purchasing power little Porto Rico evidently leads in the race. Six years have seen its purchases doubled. The same doubling appears in the Philippine purchasing power. The United States, by the Porto Rican account, includes nearly all of the imports of the island, while the Philippine account includes only a minor fraction of the imports of the archipelago. The last six years show no gain in the total imports of the Philippines. The foreign island has thus far proved to be very much the better investment for the United States. It did not cost much to get it, it costs little to keep it and it is much less trouble to us than are the Philippines. In recognition of its commendable behavior and of its standing as a buyer, to say nothing of our moral obligation, Congress should at the next regular session grant the people the recognition as American citizens they deserve.

Selecting some of the leading articles, the purchases of these various outlying possessions appear as follows for the year 1908:

Table with columns: Possession, Value. Data for Breadstuffs, Cotton, Wool, etc.

All of them bought automobiles. Hawaii led last year with 130 cars, followed by Porto Rico with 64, the Philippines 21 and Alaska 17. In motor boats Alaska bought 25, Porto Rico 9, the Philippines 7 and Hawaii 1. With the Philippines as the largest individual purchaser, these possessions took more than \$600,000 worth of electrical apparatus and machinery in 1908. Their general purchases make a long and varied list.

The development of the trade on the import side has been:

Table with columns: Possession, Value. Data for Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, Philippines.

The Alaska table does not include the shipments of gold. Those for the six year term show a value of nearly \$75,000,000. All except an insignificant fraction of the imports from Hawaii is represented by sugar. Porto Rico sends sugar, tobacco and fruits. The Philippine trade consists mainly of hemp, and Alaska's shipments consist mainly of salmon. On this import side, as well as the export side, little Porto Rico makes the best showing. There is a steady increase that shows increased production. All except a small percentage of the business, both imports and exports of goods, Hawaii and Porto Rico is done with the United States proper. Much the larger share of the business of the Philippines is done with other countries. About 80 per cent. of the exports go elsewhere, and only about one-third of the imports is obtained from this country. Politically the Philippines may be a great credit to us. Commercially they have not yet justified the investment made in them. Possibly a better showing would be made in the account if they had that relief from tariff restrictions which should have been granted several years ago and should now be given without further delay.

Welcome for a Native Boyster. To the Editor of The Sun:—There live in the oldest town in this State a man who about sixteen miles, when his party went, cultivated the social virtues of the highest degree. He stays out late and comes home "fall as a fly." He was so overjoyed at the defeat of Bryan that he did not get home until 2 o'clock in the morning. He tells the story of his reception:

"My wife made a few remarks about a 'Pretty time for a married man to come home' and 'So you have been around?' and 'What have you been doing?' I said to her: 'I was out with my boys and had a good time, and that an amusing company of good fellows were with me.' 'So you have been around, have you?' said she. 'I shall continue to do so.' 'What do you think of the deal?' Land of compassion! If she didn't get an accordion, sat upon the edge of the bed, and played on the darned old thing until morning."

The Noble Self-Sacrifice of the Bachelor. To the Editor of The Sun:—In America conditions are such that a bachelor is a social pariah. We are especially fond of looking forward to the time when we can afford a wife, and of comparing the joys of a home as we picture it to the amenities of the boarding house; but we are placed by the "high standard of life" of our country in a position that is not only a girl; and there is perhaps considerable nobility exercised by bachelors whose income is ample under a low standard but would not suffice to give them the comforts to which they are so justly accustomed. To marry out of one's class is to do a great injustice to the woman, the children, one's self, and the family for whose advancement many generations have labored. G. W. L. NEW YORK, March 17.

Chance for a Lawyer. To the Editor of The Sun:—This advertisement, from the Law Journal, speaks for itself: Wanted—Experienced and energetic trial lawyer with references; salary from \$12 to \$18; good prospects. Fine reading for a knocked out real estate lawyer. J. NEW YORK, March 17.

The Australian Throughbred. From the Washington Post. "Australia has the finest army in the Philippines most of its horses," said General Hood, Inspector of the Australian forces. "We sent hundreds of animals into the islands, and from all reports they gave excellent satisfaction. At the time of the Boer War Australia sent 18,000 troops to South Africa, and nearly all the horses that accompanied our soldiers were of this breed. The thoroughbred horse is probably not adapted to army service, but I firmly believe that the injection of thoroughbred blood is the secret of the development of the best fighting horse. The best soldiers prefer a horse that has some thoroughbred blood in him. In Australia we believe in encouraging the importation of the best horses, and I regret to hear that in America some of the States are passing legislation that is inimical to the thoroughbred. Our racecourses in Melbourne, Sydney and other large cities in Australia are patronized by thousands of people, and it is not the betting features that attract the majority of onlookers, but a desire to see contests of speed and stamina."

CHANGES AT THE CAPITAL.

From the Note Book of a Returned Native. WASHINGTON, March 17.—Prodigious changes, profound, essential and far-reaching, are prognosticated here. There are promises of reversion to original types, of the summary arrest of volunteer agencies of reform in the conduct of the general Government, of the muzzling of our most vociferous political evangelists, and generally of a sheepish if reluctant return to the processes and the personalities that contended the nation before the era of the Boomer.

Among other things—it looks small, but presents gigantic outlines to the ecstatic millions—they now propose to enlarge the executive offices at the White House, to correct the inconceivable futilities of the original arrangement and to replace with a roomy seclusion and a truly southern exposure the flagrant publicity and the climatic discomforts of the first design. The President, alone at his work or surrounded by the Cabinet advisors, will be withdrawn from the observation of the passing throng. He will be moved to the south side of the building, where wayfarers are excluded by the White House reserves proper, where in winter he will be isolated from boreal blasts and in summer accessible to the pleasant zephyrs that cool themselves in crossing the Potomac and can blow through open windows upon heated brows.

That the amendments to this unfortunate outbuilding may proceed with despatch is earnestly to be hoped. The west end offices of the White House have always been ungainly, ill suited, inconvenient. Now that they are to be extended southward over the cloisters, the observation grounds and removed from the inspection of casual pedestrians, the public can draw a deep breath of reassurance. What if the proposed changes efface the tennis court? The checkered aisles where formerly the athletic Cabinet disported in the changing shade can be profitably put to other uses now. Offices for serious business will supplant the open space once consecrated to airy capers and to loud guffaws. The people's business will supersede the gaping extravagance and an atmosphere of dignity unfold the vacant places of the hurriedly.

It is to be hoped that the magazines through the medium of their preists, prophets and pioneers—what of that? Has not that man of sin Joe Cannon, abetted by the activities of a representative majority in Congress and the discreet but significant silence of the Administration, at last put an end to the stress and mousing of the mountebanks who for long years have overloaded the air with their foolish iteration? Their influence was created in Cuba and made heroes out of Hill and Spooner, and they celebrated only the war scared veterans who slanted them on the back and talked for publication. They have since grown in power and cohesion through concert as to beef and railroads and slums and ill obtained wealth, and but for a new régime and a saner dispensation they might have but-tobled the Government itself. They seem to have been diverted to other enterprises. Representative institutions still survive. It looks as though we may emerge with credit from the inundation.

EX PROPRIO VIGORE.

A Prohibitionist Denies That the Constitution Can Carry Rum Into Dry States. To the Editor of The Sun:—Sir: To the question whether the Constitution of the United States, as it stands, entitles a citizen of the United States the right to carry his slave property into any State or Territory the party in power of all branches of the Government in 1857 answered in the affirmative. And the sovereignty of the people, with a capacity superior to any and all branches of their Government, answered in the negative, reversed the decision of their Government in an opinion written in the name of Abraham Lincoln and half a million others. "The American people was the hero," said Ralph Waldo Emerson.

To the question to-day whether the Constitution of the United States, ex proprio vigore, entitles every citizen the right to carry into any State or Territory his "exclusive judgment" and prohibition, pulling down the guards they have erected to prevent the entrance of liquor into the houses they have built up, the Republican and Democratic parties, in full power of the Government, have answered in the affirmative; and the Prohibition party a national convention answered in the negative. The opinion of a majority of the United States Senate committee that Congress has no power to restrict the right of a citizen to the invasion and nullification of State prohibition laws by liquor shipments was written by the late Hon. Rufus W. Packard, then Senator, now Secretary of State, and in pursuance of the doctrine held by his countrymen and the majority of the people, an act of Congress was passed, which, appropriately named the Knox bill, was in effect the repeal of the act of 1857, and the repeal of the act to codify, revise and amend the penal laws of the United States, which was passed in 1862, and which was the unanimous Republican and Democratic party in favor of the ex proprio vigore doctrine of the Constitution of the United States in respect to interstate commerce in intoxicating liquors will be reversed by the sovereignty of the people, and the sovereignty of the people will be restored to its former position.

PHILADELPHIA, March 16. To the Editor of The Sun:—Sir: In America conditions are such that a bachelor is a social pariah. We are especially fond of looking forward to the time when we can afford a wife, and of comparing the joys of a home as we picture it to the amenities of the boarding house; but we are placed by the "high standard of life" of our country in a position that is not only a girl; and there is perhaps considerable nobility exercised by bachelors whose income is ample under a low standard but would not suffice to give them the comforts to which they are so justly accustomed. To marry out of one's class is to do a great injustice to the woman, the children, one's self, and the family for whose advancement many generations have labored. G. W. L. NEW YORK, March 17.

Chance for a Lawyer. To the Editor of The Sun:—This advertisement, from the Law Journal, speaks for itself: Wanted—Experienced and energetic trial lawyer with references; salary from \$12 to \$18; good prospects. Fine reading for a knocked out real estate lawyer. J. NEW YORK, March 17.

The Australian Throughbred. From the Washington Post. "Australia has the finest army in the Philippines most of its horses," said General Hood, Inspector of the Australian forces. "We sent hundreds of animals into the islands, and from all reports they gave excellent satisfaction. At the time of the Boer War Australia sent 18,000 troops to South Africa, and nearly all the horses that accompanied our soldiers were of this breed. The thoroughbred horse is probably not adapted to army service, but I firmly believe that the injection of thoroughbred blood is the secret of the development of the best fighting horse. The best soldiers prefer a horse that has some thoroughbred blood in him. In Australia we believe in encouraging the importation of the best horses, and I regret to hear that in America some of the States are passing legislation that is inimical to the thoroughbred. Our racecourses in Melbourne, Sydney and other large cities in Australia are patronized by thousands of people, and it is not the betting features that attract the majority of onlookers, but a desire to see contests of speed and stamina."

March. March is a trumpeter; hark him raling! Over the hillslope the lizard sprays his rain. "Up, my masters, and no more dallying!" "Thus do his summons ring."

March is a trumpeter; there's no denying him; Quick blades fall all serrated line; Wines and breads fall within slum, delecting him; Grains and straws and snare.

March is a trumpeter; all of the drowsy Porces tremble and strain at rest; Under the skies, be they sunny or showery, Answers a blizzard's tune.

March is a trumpeter; madly, merrily, Hears him flouting it around and above; With a public rebuff, a gladcast, verily, For what he is herald of.

March. March is a trumpeter; madly, merrily, Hears him flouting it around and above; With a public rebuff, a gladcast, verily, For what he is herald of.

THE BALLOT FOR WOMEN.

A Dissent From the View That Only the Mothers Should Vote. To the Editor of The Sun:—Sir: In grudging acknowledgment of the growth of woman suffrage sentiment the Outlook says:

A courageous woman in this country recently announced that in her judgment if the ballot is put in the hands of women it ought to be put only in the hands of married women who are mothers. Her judgment was based on a sense of responsibility for a deeper interest in the welfare of the country than any other class of women; she holds that if woman suffrage is to be tried at all, it ought first to be tried with them. Moreover, this restriction, in her judgment, would put an end to the suffragettes and largely eliminate hysteria from the discussion.

The question of the ballot is of the individual conscience, mind and heart, and a sweeping generalization cannot be made. As well say that all married men and fathers of families have a deeper sense of responsibility and should be the first to prefer to vote, or that all mothers have a deeper sense of responsibility for a deeper interest in the welfare of the country than any other class of women; she holds that if woman suffrage is to be tried at all, it ought first to be tried with them. Moreover, this restriction, in her judgment, would put an end to the suffragettes and largely eliminate hysteria from the discussion.

The increase of divorce and race suicide do not evidence on the part of married women a deep interest in the welfare of their country, but a selfish interest in their own good as the "courageous woman" of the Outlook says.

The unmarried woman care for the things of the world that she may be holy both in body and in spirit; but she is married care for the things of the world.

MARY ALTHEA WOODWARD. MAPLEWOOD, N. J., March 16.

Women Can Vote and Still Remain in Their Proper Sphere. To the Editor of The Sun:—Sir: In the recent discussions on woman's rights there has been a most unfortunate confusion between two distinct subjects, namely, woman's economic competition with man and her right to vote. The very reason that I am unable to oppose the former, I am in favor of the second; that is because her functions are different from ours, being complementary but not opposed.

Suffrage is not a natural right. The question of granting it to any given class of individuals is of expediency and of whether the recipients possess the force necessary to defend their privilege.

Has woman the force necessary to uphold her political equality with man? She has once granted it to herself. The members of the fair sex could organize a union and solemnly agree to leave their husbands and not return to the conjugal roof until such time as the attacks on their privileges and rights were not only stopped but long before a trumpet call would be sounded from every pulpit in the land, and summons to mass meetings would be issued in a hundred languages, professional politicians would join hands.