The Sun.

TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 1910.

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.

All checks, money orders, &c., to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President of the Association, Edward P. Mitchell, 170 Nassau street; Treasurer of the Association, M. F. Laffan, 170 Nassau street; Secretary of the Association, D. W. Quinn, 170 Nassau street.

London office, Effingham House, 1 Arundel street, Strand. The daily and Sunday SUN are on sale in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, Carlton street, Regent street, and Daw's Steamship Agency, 17 Green street, Charing Cross Road.

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.

Postponement.

What will be the effect upon the general business and financial situation of the act of the Supreme Court of the United States, announced yesterday, in ordering a reargument in the American Tobacco and Standard Oil cases? Most people, we think, will have considerable difficulty in making up their minds from the data at present afforded. The trouble is that there can be only conjecture as to the precise reason which induced or compelled the court to take this step. In Wall Street, or at least in speculative Wall Street, the postponement of a decision will doubtless be hailed as a "favorable" event, inasmuch as in this quarter anything that is indefinitely postponed loses much of its influence as a stock market factor. The conclusion does seem inevitable that the expected final word by the Supreme Court on the subject will not now be spoken until toward the end of the year, if indeed a full year may not elapse before this event takes place. Inasmuch as the court adjourns toward the end of May for its long summer vacation the current belief is that the reargument in the cases will not take place before October; but a stronger reason for inferring that the reargument will be delayed until the time stated is that the sitting members of the court now comprise, so far as the Standard Oil and American Tobacco cases are concerned, only seven Justices. A positive vacancy has been created by the death of Mr. Justice BREWER, and a practical vacancy by the fact that Mr. Justice MOODY is ill without hope of an immediate recovery and is further incapacitated from taking part in the deliberations upon the two cases owing to the circumstance that he was Attorney-General of the United States when the Government suits against the American Tobacco and Standard Oil companies were begun.

The deduction that will be commonly made is, of course, that the reargument of the cases is due to complications resulting from the death of Mr. Justice BREWER, and specifically that the taking off of this venerable and esteemed jurist has left the court so evenly divided upon the great constructions of law involved that it feels bound as a matter of policy to ask for a rehearing of the cases before a full bench or at least a bench upon which more than seven members sit. Rumors have been constantly heard, we do not know upon what authority, that Mr. Justice MOODY'S physical condition was such that he might retire from the court altogether, and it has also been said that one or more of the remaining Judges might also resign soon because of increasing age. This necessarily renders interest acute as to the personality of the man or men who will be appointed by President TAFT to fill the vacancy or vacancies.

However considered, we feel sure that it will be a matter of regret and disappointment among the business men of the country that the final settlement of the anti-trust matter, or at least a definite adjudication of the points raised in the American Tobacco and Standard Oil cases, must now be delayed for a long further time. Wall Street may rejoice that it will not have to hold its breath every Monday now in ensuing weeks awaiting the Supreme Court decision in these cases. Business interests proper will, we believe, feel sorry that the affair could not have been ended sooner.

Southern Statesmanship.

Our very good friend the Hon. JOHN B. KNOX of Anniston, Alabama, has written THE SUN a letter, which we had pleasure in publishing. His comments related to our criticism of Senator BANKHEAD'S "good roads" scheme, and while he did not condemn the criticism, but on the contrary admitted its justice, he had a great deal to say about other matters which, as it happened, THE SUN had not even remotely touched upon.

The quotation from the Hon. JAMES G. BLAINE'S "Twenty Years in Congress" contains a high tribute to Southern statesmanship. So did the reminiscences of the Hon. J. L. M. CURRY of Alabama, and the speech of Senator HAMMOND of South Carolina in 1858. But these excellent gentlemen were referring to a period which terminated years ago and was far removed from any strictures THE SUN'S article may have suggested or implied. We were not discussing the days of Southern domination in Congress nor yet the post-bellum times of HAMPTON, BUTLER, BEN HILL, ALEXANDER STEPHENS, WALTHALL, LAMAR, EUSTIS, WHITE and the rest of that splendid galaxy that shone upon us for a few years after reconstruction. Our references were addressed to the situation of the last twenty years, of course excepting MORGAN of Alabama, a lonesome survival of a greater day, and they concerned for instance the fish fry at Mobile, a year or two ago, when Senators and Representatives of Alabama thundered at the national Treasury's gates and promised their audience good roads if it took the last dollar in the great strong box.

Where are these conservative and self-respecting Southern statesmen of whom the Hon. JOHN B. KNOX discourses with such easy eloquence? We doff our hat to the honored dead, but they are gone. We concern ourselves with the present and the living.

The Lords to Go Root and Branch.

Mr. ASQUITH has burned his ships behind him. In his speech on the second of his resolutions, which puts an end to the control of the Lords over legislation of any kind, he adopts openly the views of the extreme wing of his party. However they may be reformed, whatever limitations on their present prerogatives may be accepted, the House of Lords must go and the sole power be left to the Commons, which may or may not set up a second chamber of a different sort as it chooses. The royal veto is as dead as Queen ANNE, the House of Lords is an anachronism which it is now time to get rid of.

In how far the Liberal Prime Minister has been driven to take the position he now assumes by the demands and threats of the Labor and Nationalist allies, on whom he depends for his precarious majority, future historians may decide. The point of interest at this moment is whether he represents his party in the contest at hand, whether he will be able to carry with him enough Liberals to put the project of the extreme faction through the House of Commons. Among those who were returned as Liberals at the last election are men who are attached to the British Constitution as it exists and men who are as much opposed to home rule for Ireland as any Conservative can be. Will party loyalty make these men vote for an avowedly revolutionary proposal? Will Mr. ASQUITH venture to force it through with a majority lessened by Liberal defections?

A Little Chapter on "Half Truths."

A few days ago THE SUN published "A Little Chapter on Wool," in which the statement was made that the flocks of the United States had decreased from a total of 64,000,000 head in 1903 to 56,000,000 in 1909. To this Mr. THEODORE JUSTICE of Philadelphia takes exception, declaring it to be a misleading "half truth." He holds that "to show what has been done for sheep under the present rate on wool duties you must take the whole period covered."

	1897.	1910.
Sheep and lambs	37,000,000	57,000,000

This is 50 per cent., or 20,000,000, increase.

Sheep raising is in part a question of food products and in part a question of wool and sheep skins. Several half truths may be cited, including that of the 50 per cent. increase in the flock. The wool clip of 1897 was 259,000,000 pounds and the clip of 1909 was 328,000,000 pounds. Thus we have a 50 per cent. increase in the flock and an increase of only 27 per cent. in the wool clip. Because of the technicalities of the business price comparison is difficult, but the quotations for January, 1897, on washed Ohio fleece were about 20 cents a pound and the quotations for January, 1910, were nearly 40 cents, an increase of nearly 100 per cent. Apparently if the tariff is responsible for an increase of 50 per cent. in the number of sheep it is also responsible for an increase of only 27 per cent. in the wool clip and for an increase of nearly 100 per cent. in the price of washed Ohio fleece. Also, if the tariff increased the flock from 37,000,000 in 1897 to 57,000,000 in 1910, is it not also fair to say that it increased the flock from 37,000,000 in 1897 to 64,000,000 in 1903 and decreased it to 57,000,000 in 1910?

That the tariff has been a factor in the increase in the number of sheep in the country may not be denied. The transfer of wool to the free list in the Wilson tariff of 1894 frightened sheep raisers and reduced the flocks from 45,000,000 head in 1894 to 37,000,000 head in 1897. The reestablishment of sheep raising as a highly protected industry naturally resulted in an increase in the flocks. Yet these various truths and half truths and various others like unto them do not materially affect statements which our critic appears to have read as an argument for free wool rather than as a collection of facts bearing on an interesting question. Mr. JUSTICE is in the wool business. He is a beneficiary under the tariff. In his solicitude for the American wool business he magnified an incident and seems to have overlooked the more important statements of the article he criticises. The flocks have increased, as he says, from 37,000,000 to 57,000,000 since 1897. They have also decreased, as THE SUN said, from 64,000,000 in 1903 to 56,000,000 in 1909. The more important statement of the article criticised was that reduction or removal of the duties on wool would probably make little difference in the price of clothing, blankets, carpets, &c.

Assume that yesterday the entire flock of the United States was sunk in the middle of the ocean, or assume that it was utterly wiped out by transfer of wool to the free list. There would still be need of wool, and draft would necessarily be made on the limited supply of the world. The inevitable result would be an increase in price of imported wool to approximately the present level of prices for American wool. Prices would advance the world over by reason of the American demand. There appears to be decline rather than increase in total world supply. The world clip of 1906 is reported as 87,500,000 less than the clip of 1894. The object of the "Little Chapter on Wool" was rather to correct the prevalent mistaken belief that free wool would result in an immediate and heavy reduction in the price of woollen goods than to urge tariff reduction on the material in which our critic is financially interested.

The article served also to call attention to the fact that our farmers are not fully improving the opportunity afforded by a very liberal measure of protection. In spite of an enormous increase in the number of farms and farmers the number of sheep in the United States east of the Mississippi River has in the last forty years dropped from 21,000,000 to 15,000,000. In Montana, Wyoming and Idaho there are more sheep than in all the country east of the Mississippi.

Mr. JUSTICE'S comment confirms the statement of our earlier article that experts can and do figure from the wool schedules support for any argument they may see fit to advance. His sensitiveness regarding an industry in which he is interested appears to have led to an oversight of the purpose and the drift of the "Little Chapter on Wool." It criticised the farmers rather than the tariff. It was a presentation of supposedly interesting facts rather than of a tariff argument. On December 3, 1908, months before the Payne bill was born, THE SUN ventured the assertion that "there is every probability that free hides would make only a trifling difference in the price of hides and no difference whatever to the users of finished products." To-day, with hides on the free list, the price is practically the same as it was then and the cost of finished products is at least no lower. It is probable that free wool would practically repeat the experience of free hides. The price of raw wool might be reduced by a fraction, but the price of woollen goods would probably be little if at all reduced. Reduction in the price of woollen goods could be brought about by free woollens and the wreck of an important American industry.

The investment in American woollen mills is double the investment in sheep.

Does the Company Contribute?

Two years ago the managers of the Brooklyn Rapid Transit announced that they had completed plans for the protection of their orderly passengers from assaults by the rowdies who for several years had been not only a nuisance but a positive danger in the cars run by the company. This announcement was followed by appropriate activities, and a considerable improvement in conditions resulted. It is therefore to be hoped that City Magistrate O'REILLY is misled as to what he conceives to be the present attitude of the company, which, he declared on Sunday, "made it a practice to have serious charges reduced to minor charges," in order to avoid the bother and expense of prosecution.

Those Magistrates who through mistaken tenderness for youthful offenders or because of social or political influences have dealt easily with these ruffians have been severely and properly criticised. If the companies owning the roads adopt, from any motive, a policy of non-prosecution they deserve the same kind of treatment. The rowdy passengers on public conveyances need no such encouragement to inspire them to continued assaults and indecencies. In passing, it is not improper to point out that the toleration of these lawbreakers in the beginning by the public, the transportation corporations and the police was the primary mistake in their treatment, which has resulted in the outrageous conditions annually recurrent and apparent.

The devotion of the month of April in each year to cooperative efforts by transportation managers, police and Magistrates for the suppression of car rowdies would insure peaceful summers. If any of these agencies fails in its duty there is no prospect of anything approaching comfort or security for decent travellers.

A Fight for a Senatorship.

Attorney-General GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM'S hint to the insurgents, "he that 'hath no stomach to the fight' let him depart," will not be taken by the Hon. ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE. The Grand Young Man is full of fight—for a Senatorship; and he hasn't the faintest desire to leave the Republican party. His position is not generally understood. As his term was closing there was something like a revolution in Indiana politics. Mr. TAFT, the Republican candidate for President, carried the State, but by a plurality of only 10,731; Mr. McKINLEY received 18,181 in 1896 and 26,470 in 1900, and Mr. ROOSEVELT, profiting by the defection of the Bryan Democrats, had a plurality of 93,944 in 1904. But if the electoral vote of the State was saved to Mr. TAFT two years ago, the Democratic candidate for Governor, the Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL, topped Mr. TAFT'S plurality, receiving one of 14,453; ten out of thirteen Congress districts were carried by the Democrats and their majority in the Legislature on joint ballot was sixteen. When the Legislature met former Representative BENJAMIN F. SHIVELY was elected United States Senator. Mr. SHIVELY, it happened, was a Cleveland tariff reformer. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House he had been very active in the tariff legislation that followed the election of Mr. CLEVELAND in 1892. His tariff record had always been sound, straightforward, and to his constituents in Indiana satisfactory. When the Payne bill was under consideration in the Senate Mr. SHIVELY had no axe to grind. He was a tariff for revenue Democrat and he stuck to his guns.

Imagine the effect of the political turnover in Indiana upon the impressionable and ambitious senior Senator. In the bloom of his youth he was not ready to retire; the Senate had become his life, and greatness was his goal. The leaven of tariff reform is always working in Indiana, and it is an issue to conjure with. Mr. BEVERIDGE could indulge no hope of perpetuating himself in the Senate unless he distinguished himself as a Henry of Navarre of tariff reform. He knew that the Payne tariff bill as drafted would not please the folks in Indiana, and he assailed it almost like a Democrat who wanted no protection for his district. In the end he voted against the bill. It was the sensation of the hour in Indiana; everybody was talking about it. But if Mr. BEVERIDGE rejected the Payne bill, he accepted all the patronage he could wheedle out of the President, and contrived to build up a respectable personal machine in the State. He was shrewd enough not to neglect the Fairbanks retainers; most of them to-day feel very kindly toward the acute BEVERIDGE. At the State convention he signalized himself still further by contrasting his ideas of tariff revision with those of Mr. TAFT, to the disadvantage of the President, who had filled the lap of the Grand Young Man with patronage.

As a strategist who has his own fortunes to mend Mr. BEVERIDGE pursued the only course that could redound to his own welfare, whether he emerged personally triumphant from the fray or went down to defeat as a brave tariff reformer in an off year and therefore a Democratic year. In short, Mr. BEVERIDGE is loyal to himself. It is interesting to note what the Democratic Governor of Indiana, Mr. MARSHALL, a shrewd politician, thinks of Mr. BEVERIDGE'S chances:

"I believe that there is not more than 40 per cent. of insurgency in the Republican party of Indiana. I believe 60 per cent. of the Republican voters are content with the present tariff law.

"Mr. BEVERIDGE cannot appeal to a tariff for revenue Democrat because he still stands for protection. His hope of gaining largely from Democratic ranks, in my opinion, is ill founded. For whatever may be said about any other Senator, Senator SHIVELY, Democrat, stood fast by the faith in a revenue tariff. I do not think that all Republicans who are satisfied with the tariff will vote for Senator BEVERIDGE. It looks to me as if they were self-disfranchised. They cannot support Senator BEVERIDGE and they will not support the Democratic party of Indiana."

With a decisive victory to their credit in the State and an opportunity to gain another Senatorship the Democrats certainly have no cause to rally to the aid of Mr. BEVERIDGE, who if an insurgent is nevertheless a partisan Republican. We are inclined to think that Governor MARSHALL puts the proportion of insurgents in Indiana too high, but it is large enough to give the Democrats hope of increasing their majority in the Legislature, especially as stalwart Administration Republicans feel very bitter toward the senior Senator, whose genius for looking after his own interests is no secret. But let no one think that he will allow himself to be read out of the party. He hath stomach for the fight and will loudly proclaim himself a Republican until the polls open.

Students of the American temperament, economics and social phenomena must be prepared soon to ponder this problem: Why, when they are less in price, are upper sleeper berths more disesteemed than when they cost as much as lower berths?

After the tremendous ebullition contrived by the Honorable Thingumbob and the equally Honorable So-and-So, what happens? The Committee on Rules has been enlarged from five to ten, the Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON still presides and the old rules are still in force. Nothing has been changed. The ancient order continues to prevail. There are privileged measures, appropriations to conduct the Government, just as there have always been, and miscellaneous measures, 40,000 or so of them, from which the House must pick and choose. Most of these measures will never see the light, as indeed they should not and as their authors quite expected in the first place. The others will be taken up in the order of their intrinsic importance, and in rare cases a rule may have to be formulated in order to get them out of limbo. The difference is that a committee of ten instead of a committee of five will establish the order of precedence.

That is all. There is nothing more to be said of it, and with the exception of war dances by the Hon. VICTOR MURDOCK and others the surface of Congressional procedure is as unruffled as that of any ordinary frog pond. The teapot steamed and bubbled very tempestuously for a moment, but it has subsided now to plain tea.

The decision of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court in a suit by which an opera manager sought the law's aid to compel an operatic star to abide by a contract determines nothing that is new in practice even though novel in precept, if it is rightly interpreted by lawyers for theatre and opera managers. These say that the decision in effect relieves stage stars from obligations to observe contracts. We are under the impression that managers have long complained that that quality of the artistic temperament which burns in the stage star melts aught so cold as a sense of obligation to do a thing which bores or is contrary to whim. The manager, swayed by the commercial rather than the artistic temperament, remains subject to law even when a star, confidently contracted with as a warm propostition, proves to be a black frost. Surely this is another strong indictment against a commercialized stage.

There is unconscious humor in the handsome colored post card that has been sent out to advertise the international exhibition of art that will be held at Venice this year. The central object in the picture is the topstory of the Dogana, the Custom House, with the figure of Fortune above it and the standard bearing the lion of St. Mark at the side. Across the Grand Canal rise the cupolas of St. Mark's, and the waters are almost hidden by a fleet of mediæval craft gay with banners. Over the doors of the Dogana is inscribed the legend *Artium Portus*, but the doors are closed, an intimation, perhaps, that art is stopped by the Custom House.

In his tribute to the late DAVID A. DE ARMOND in the House on Saturday Representative CHAMP CLARK recalled a famous saying of Speaker REED:

"No gentleman has a right to pour his undigested ideas upon a defenceless House."

It had no application to Mr. DE ARMOND, whose speeches were extemporaneous and always to the point, but among Mr. CLARK'S hearers there must have been those who blushed to the roots of their hair, if they are not case hardened.

Portents in Provence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* To-day Tartarin landed in Naples and it snowed at Tarascon. To-night it is still snowing at Avignon and Tartarin is on his way to Rome. What do you make of it? G.

AVIGNON, France, April 1.

His Way.

Knicker—Is Jones charitable?

Bocker—Well, he doesn't let his right foot know whom his left foot kicks.

THE CHICAGO PLATFORM BONDAGE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Does each and every Republican realize the efforts of the author of the opening sentences of the Chicago platform to make the party a political bondsman forever to Colonel Roosevelt and his policies? A loyal Republican should in these days read again that document and endeavor to comprehend the attitude in which it endeavored to put all candidates nominated and elected under it. These are some of its words:

In this the great era of American advancement the Republican party has reached its highest service under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt. His administration is an epoch in American history. In no other period since national sovereignty was won under Washington, or preserved under Lincoln, has there been such mighty progress in those ideals of government which make for justice, equality and fair dealing among men. The highest aspirations of the American people have found a voice. Their most exalted servant represents the best aims and worthiest purposes of all his countrymen. American manhood has been lifted to a nobler sense of duty and obligation. Conscience and courage in public station and higher standards of right and wrong in private life have become cardinal principles of political faith; capital and labor have been brought into closer relations of confidence and interdependence, and the abuse of wealth, the tyranny of power and all the evils of privilege and favoritism have been put to scorn by the simple, manly virtues of justice and fair play.

Roosevelt was placed next to Washington! His voice uttered the "highest aspirations of the American people." He has been "their most exalted servant!" "The best aims and worthiest purposes," not merely of the members of the Republican party but "of all his countrymen," find representation in him! All the evils of "privilege and favoritism" have been put to scorn by "his simple, manly virtues!" From him our blessings flow!

The name of the author of that conservation of laudation is not generally known to fame. Perhaps he does not at this moment desire to fill the sounding trump.

After making those measured utterances the author goes on to enumerate Colonel Roosevelt's "great accomplishments" as President. Neither Congressmen nor any member of the Cabinet is mentioned as entitled to share in the exceptional work of legislation and administration. The platform proclaims:

These are the achievements that will make for Theodore Roosevelt his place in history, but more than all else the great things he has done will be an inspiration to those who have yet greater things to do.

Finally comes the crowning utterance by which the author constrains "the Republican party, in national convention assembled," to make this stipulation:

We declare our unfaltering adherence to the policies thus inaugurated and pledge their continuance under a Republican administration of the Government.

There is the bond of the party that Colonel Roosevelt holds which binds it to continue his "policies" so long as it holds power. "My policies" are described with clear certainty in the prelude and in the sequence.

"The Government" is mentioned. Perhaps the mention is of the national Government only and does not refer to any State Government like that of Indiana.

Can the Republican party or its President or its Congress repudiate or tear up the bond upon the ground that it was intended, like party platforms, only for election purposes?

If the stipulation was not made to bind Republican State conventions, then the Republicans of Indiana will be safe, and they will not be rebels because they refused to approve legislation by a Republican Congress for which a Republican majority voted and which a Republican President pronounced in conformity with the Chicago platform. Otherwise the Indiana Republicans, in State convention assembled, were depraved perverts of heinous quality. They even ventured to take sides with "The Economic Man" and demand the right to buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market.

But that is a trifling detail in comparison with the bond that Colonel Roosevelt holds binding every loyal Republican, in office or out of office, to adhere unfalteringly to "my policies" and enforce them by legislation and administration so long as in power! VARSAL.

NEW YORK, April 11.

LITERARY ETHICS.

Circumstances Under Which Borrowing Is Reprehensible.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Between the lines of "J. G. J.'s" letter I discover a certain delight on the part of the writer that he has discovered a parallel between a one act play lately produced and one of Balzac's stories. Well, why not? Is this, if intentional, plagiarism? Charles Reade once said that the dramatization of a play from a book was no plagiarism at all, and I agree with him. The two things are absolutely and entirely different, and are treated differently.

If I write a story and some one else can improve on it there is no plagiarism in the latter's improvement. If I see a man with a coat I like can't I improve on that pattern and make a still better coat? is there, can there be, any originality in music? Hadn't Virgil a perfect right to borrow from Homer? Wasn't Moore the greatest plagiarist that ever lived? Were not Tennyson, Shakespeare, Kipling, in fact haven't all the great writers been accused of plagiarism? And yet their works are certainly out of the common!

As matter of fact plagiarism is very hard to commit, and it takes a man of talent for its perpetration. A fool can't do it, or if he does he is sure to be found out. There are no new ideas. It is the clothing of the idea and the writer's distinctive style that count. The only real plagiarism consists of copying a man's book in its entirety.

In the present case there is a great difference in the composition of a story and the writing of a play. There is absolutely no plagiarism in a man taking an old story, for of course copyright is something in these days, and turning it into a play. I'm looking for a story for that purpose myself, and if I consider, with the help of the public, that it is an improvement in a theatrical way on the story I get my plot from I shall most certainly not consider myself a plagiarist.

NEW YORK, April 9. BRETSNODY.

George Washington II.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I had occasion to go to the Republican headquarters today and was permitted to enter the sanctum sanctorum, George Washington Aldridge's private office. Around the room were hung the portraits of eminent Republicans living and dead. I noted one conspicuous absentee: the stern, bearded visage of Governor Hughes was not there.

Perhaps according to the Aldridge standard Governor Hughes is not a Republican. Perhaps there is some other reason. In any event he was not admitted to the illustrious company of Lincoln, Garfield, Arthur, McKinley, Roosevelt, Taft, Aldridge and Aldridge's lesser namesake. I wonder why? PEEPING TOM.

ROCHESTER, April 9.

Cruel Test for a Statesman's Words.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* If it is true, as President Taft says, that only half of the people of this country, the half of which the Republican party is composed, are fit to govern the country, is it not equally true then that popular free government in America is a failure and that instead of "a government of the people, by the people and for the people" we have a government only of the Republican party, by the Republican party and for the Republican party? E. H. S.

NEW YORK, April 11.

Season Opens.

Now business with a shiver views
The juggernaut afar.
And wonders should it hop aboard
The open tariff car.

WHAT ABOUT THE DEMOCRATS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Will the gentlemen who assume to guide the Democratic party show any wisdom this time, or is it again to be a case of leadership so dishonest or so small as to cause the country to fear it or to laugh at it?

In Congress we are having a daily spectacle of high school politics presented by grown men whose political smallness is so overwhelming that they can conceive of no audience greater than the voting population of a Congress district.

Do these men know that stage coaches and river steamers are antiquated; that we have telegraph wires and telephones and daily newspapers everywhere; that the rural mails are now delivered promptly, and that most of the citizens of the United States habitually read and write?

Of what interest is it to the millions of Democrats in this country that the Republican members of Congress are now and then forced to "go on record" in a game of political marbles played on the floor of the House or Senate? Do these astute parliamentarians (while playing to the galleries and thereby missing the really big things) fancy that the thing has in it anything whatever of political or patriotic import to the country? Is their political horizon so befogged by the provincialism of Washington as to shut out wholly perspective and sense of proportion?

It is not a town council that sits there in Washington, but a body of men supposedly legislating for the people of the United States. How many of them are there who have the mental and patriotic equipment required? How many are there who ought never to have tried for anything more embracing than membership on a board of county commissioners? It is such men who assume to make and unmake the policies of the Democratic party, who name the game the Democratic voters must play and deal the cards the players must use.

Take Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota and Wisconsin, for instance. Are the Democratic Murphys and Taggarts again to be permitted to play the small game of politics inspired by political ignorance or corrupt selfishness?

In Indiana is Mr. Taggart preparing to fight Beveridge or help him? In Iowa will the Democrats put up straw men for Congress? These are merely two cases to illustrate the point. Everywhere the opportunity will present itself this fall for a wonderful strengthening of the forces of tariff reform in the House of Representatives, and it will be impossible for the Senate to stand up against it. Under such conditions no one need fear that any wild eyed scheme for ripping the tariff schedules wide open can succeed. What is done will be done by Democrats and Republicans voting together to do away with the really vicious and unjust things in the Payne-Aldrich law, and that is what the country wants to have done in a prompt and orderly manner. D. M.

ST. PAUL, April 10.

Experts in Art.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The mistakes of the most experienced experts in art do not disturb essential values. Probably no two students of Leonardo da Vinci would agree exactly in their reconstruction of the great master's career in his art from the literary and stylistic evidence, yet that career is in its main lines a perfectly visible episode of history. The mistakes of expertise or criticism are necessary in the positive reconstruction of the facts. Dr. Bode, for instance, the most famous of all art experts, who seems to have been recently led into error by his enthusiasm, has contributed a great deal of light to the problem of Leonardo's art, especially by his almost exhaustive studies on Verocchio, from whom the great master derives so much of his craft. But it is quite within the capacity of any intelligent and fairly experienced amateur of form visible to determine for himself on general grounds of probability the distinction between Leonardo and his poorer imitators, whose drawings are often accepted by uncritical eyes—by the late M. Muntz, for instance—as authentic works by the master himself. In the case of any supposed imitation of art, as with the recent alleged imitations of Homer Martin's paintings, it would be easy enough to get an overwhelming consensus of opinion one way or another, which would settle matters morally. Scientific or legal proof, on the other hand, seems difficult with questions of æsthetic value. The classic instance, of course, is the Ruskin-Whistler trial.

For most of us there is comfort in the undeniable fact that, as I remarked some time ago in your columns, forgeries or copies of fine art do not get into first rate modern museums, or when they occasionally do they are invariably criticised and protested against by some established authority—not necessarily, however, in public. R.

NEW YORK, April 11.

Sheep, Wool and the Verities.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In printing only half truths in your editorial article entitled "A Little Chapter on Wool" you mislead.

To show what has been done for sheep under the present rate on wool duties you must take the whole period covered. To-day, 1910, there are 57,000,000 sheep and lambs. In 1897 there were 37,000,000. This is over 50 per cent., or 20,000,000 increase.

The drop from 1903 was owing to the increasing mutton eating habit, which is world-wide, as you will see by Senate Document 440.

THE SUN can afford to be mistaken, but it cannot afford knowingly to misrepresent, as you have a potent influence in shaping public sentiment. THEODORE JUSTICE.

PHILADELPHIA, April 7.

Lost Maine Border Line.

From the Rockland Opinion.

There is a curious mixup all along the border where South Thomaston and St. George adjoin owing to the inability of anybody to find any record, survey or other means of determining where the line is. The location cannot be determined within half a mile, and there are many hundred acres of land and many homesteads of which nobody knows whether they are in St. George or South Thomaston. One gentleman, who has paid taxes and voted in St. George all his life, informs us that he does not now know where he lives. His property and poll have been assessed by both towns, both threaten to sell him out for taxes if he doesn't pay. He positively refuses to pay taxes in both towns, and for the present, until somebody can tell him where he lives, will not pay in either.

Ancient History.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The Thundering Legion was pursuing the lightning stricken Quadi.

Standing on the towering eminence of his future greatness, Marcus Aurelius wrapped his khaki cloak about him and calmly remarked, "We have them beaten to a frazzle!"

FRANCOIS TRANB.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 11.

House Guests and Week Ends.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Will you not extend your curse so that it may also rest upon "week end"? "House guests" are always for "week ends," which should decide the matter for you. My friends frequently spend Sunday with me, but among them there are no "week enders." ALSO WEARY.

MONTCLAIR, April 11.

Paradise Unguined.

The world's too much with me!
Though I would fain withdraw myself
To sylvan grove like timid elf,
Or lodge in some vast wilderness,
In everglade where men ne'er press
I cannot hidden be!

Too much perhaps I try!
I bid the world in trumpet tone
Be calm, begone! Leave me alone!
With powers of might I wrangle loud
That I may not arouse the crowd,
Attract its loathsome eye!

I long to be unknown!
Subdued beneath my cloak of gold,
Announced by bell, by trumpet bold,
The herald's din proclaiming me,
I seek, with violet's modesty,
To be unseen—alone!

EDWARD W. TOWNSEND.

FOR SENATOR FROM ALABAMA.

Remarks That Indicate That the Political Heated Term Is Near.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* John B. Knox, candidate against John H. Bankhead in the race for Senator from Alabama, having retired to his library on Tyler Hill in the still hopeful city of Anniston, has at last emerged with a "ringing reply" to THE SUN'S article in which Ben Jonson's epitaph on the Countess of Pembroke was satirically applied to Knox's opponent: "Who is there in Alabama better, wiser, purer and more accomplished?"

In these words Mr. Knox read libel against the State of Alabama which demanded clarion refutation. There was no doubt in his mind as to the identity of the clarion refutator's identity. Hence his ringing rebuke, concluding with a sonorous appeal that we "think of King of Yancey, of Morgan and Pettus," and, shutting his eyes, with a sweet smile of auto-inspection he modestly left off the phrase that would have utterly damned THE SUN'S blasphemy: "Think of Knox."

Mr. Knox is a serious minded statesman. When to Mr. Taft were being pointed out the significant features of Augusta he noticed as he drove past an enormous gentleman seated on a porch, glorious in his easy contemplation of the passersby. Answering his natural inquiry, an informant said: "That, Mr. President, is the only man in the United States who can strut sitting." The President's informant was wrong.

He has confided to the people of Alabama in the announcement which resulted from days of seclusion in his library that when a boy of 17 the whole current of his life was changed by reading Calhoun's reply to Webster. "It is a grand thing," wrote Mr. Knox, "to speak for your people and to speak for your section. No other man has ever approached John C. Calhoun in the capacity and ability to discharge this duty." He hastens, however, to tell us that John C. Calhoun has been his standard of statesmanship. Q. E. D.

A gentleman of Mr. Knox's universality is not to be limited, however, to the equipment of Calhoun. In later proclamations, for Mr. Knox retires frequently to his library on Tyler Hill during campaigns, Mr. Knox confesses to the statesmanship of Jefferson and the literary felicity of Alexander Hamilton, for, mistaking some playful criticism of his literary fecundity for a reflection upon his style, he says:

But the gentlemen in question criticise my English. In this connection it may not be impertinent for me to say that I am quite willing that it may be compared with their own. My standard of statesmanship has been Thomas Jefferson, than whom this country has produced no greater. My standard of composition has been Alexander Hamilton. " " " I challenge any one to show where I have ever written a sentence the meaning of which the humblest citizen could not read and understand.

The Anniston High School scans with classical enthusiasm each product of Mr. Knox's seclusion. "In this connection," wrote Mr. Knox in a recent oration, harking back to a selection of epigrams: "I am reminded of the way in which Disraeli disposed of a similar attack on himself in the British Parliament. He did it in a single sentence: 'The honorable gentleman,' he said, 'ought to know, if they do not know, that insolence is not argument, and that insolence is not invective.'" It is understood that the high school is to have the pamphlet containing this classic effort engrossed and signed by the very hand of Anniston's most ponderous citizen. Yet Mr. Knox should be wary lest Senator Bankhead make use of that other retort of Disraeli's to the effect that his opponent had a wonderful ability to "illustrate the obvious, emphasize the ordinary and enlarge upon the commonplace."

Yes, Mr. Knox is serious, not to say tragic. When attending a recent reception Mr. Knox stepped outside for a breath of the fresh night air. In the dark he wandered into a small clump of trees, and after bumping from one to another and then into a third he stopped and tragically exclaimed: "Lost! In an impenetrable forest." Mr. Knox functions with dignity. Running for the Senate is for him a solemn rite—or write, according to the point of view.

This solemnity of Mr. Knox's contributes a humorous quality to a campaign which would otherwise be relieved solely by Mr. Bankhead's appeal to the voters of Alabama to continue him in the Senate until he shall provide the Alabama hill billies with good roads at Federal expense and by Frank S. White's gum soled efforts to conceal from the wary Alabamians the fact that his residence in Alabama was accelerated by a contest for Congress with the present senior Senator from Mississippi, in which Mr. Money debated with him to such personal effect that Captain White abandoned the race and subsequently left the State, which reminds one of the surprise expressed by Private John Allen at finding so many Mississippians in Arkansas, although, as he asserted, a great many of them would have been cleared if they had remained in Mississippi. JOHN MOFFAT.

BIRMINGHAM, Ala., April 9.

Our Neglected South American Trade Opportunity.

South America, with its overseas commerce worth $1,500,000,000 a year, increasing at the rate of $100,000,000 a year, is our commercial opportunity, an opportunity which will give us very much larger fruitage in trade as soon as the American Panama Canal is completed and the American merchant marine resumes its place and prestige in South American waters and ports on both the Atlantic and the Pacific sides.

The figures in round millions of dollars of trade between us during the last ten years are (Bureau of statistics):

	Imports from South America.	Exports to South America.
1900	$163,000,000	$41,000,000
1901	150,000,000	43,000,000
1902	160,000,000	39,000,000
1903	113,000,000	46,000,000
1904	140,000,000	53,000,000
1905	145,000,000	66,000,000
1906	148,000,000	70,000,000
1907	148,000,000	86,000,000
1908	132,000,000	77,000,000
1909	160,000,000	84,000,000
Totals for ten years	$1,351,000,000	$614,000,000
Total trade in ten years		$1,965,000,000
Yearly average of total trade		196,500,000
Yearly average of imports from		135,100,000
Yearly average of exports to		61,400,000

By countries the 1909 trade was:

	Exports to	Imports from
Argentina	$36,287,201	$27,080,231
Brazil	19,785,836	117,062,725
Chile	6,787,537	14,700,204
Peru	4,371,068	7,164,384
Uruguay	4,016,105	3,708,814
Colombia	3,472,652	7,203,383
Venezuela	2,529,669	7,772,851
Ecuador	2,202,849	2,452,819
British Guiana	2,028,480	533,348
Bolivia	898,858	223
Dutch Guiana	717,415	808,036
French Guiana	26,608	363,561
Paraguay	19,338	60,674
Falkland Islands		1,142
Totals	$83,500,017	$193,202,131
Total trade in 1909		$276,711,178

In 1909 compared with 1908 both Argentina and Brazil increased their purchases of American goods by $3,000,000. Chile also increased by $1,500,000 and Uruguay by $900,000. Peru bought $1,500,000 less.

The increases in our purchases were Brazil, $36,000