

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 \$5.00. SUNDAY, Per Year \$2.00. DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year \$6.00. DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month \$0.50.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 130 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President of the Association, Edward P. Mitchell, 130 Nassau street. Treasurer of the Association, M. F. Laflin, 130 Nassau street. Secretary of the Association, D. W. Quinn, 130 Nassau street.

London office, 21, Abchurch Lane, E. C. 4, London, E. C. The office and Sunday office are at 130 Nassau street, New York. Representatives in London, Messrs. G. & J. Carter, 17, Green Street, Charing Cross.

Paris office, 21, Rue de la Paix. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel, Kiosque 7, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opera, and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Invalides, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

On leaving the city for the summer you may have the Sun sent to you by mail at the regular subscription rate, addresses being changed as often as desired.

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

The Last Phase.

Has not the time been reached in the business of this State when common sense and common decency alike demand that there shall be an end of the direct primary debate for the present year? The Hinman-Green bill is dead. After a fair debate and a free vote seventy-seven Assemblymen voted against it and eighty-two against permitting it to come up again during the present session. Is it not, then, an appropriate time to return to actual business of State government?

At the present moment day is made intolerable and night hideous by the denunciations, lamentations, objurgations of the supporters of the Governor's bill. In defeat they have become even more violent than in earlier attack. At the head of every legislator who opposed them they are now leveling a torrent of abuse, accusation and denunciation which might easily earn applause from the army in Flanders. Nor does the performance end here. Not only those distinguished citizens outside of political life who expressed their honest distrust of the Hinman-Green bill but also the Hon. CHARLES EVANS HUGHES, who declined to compel a hostile Assembly to accept this bill, are being denounced in passionate attacks.

The attacks upon the Governor and upon those private citizens who opposed his bill in a memorial may be set down to disappointment and the natural bitterness of defeat. The attacks upon the members of the Legislature have a different explanation. In the language of the direct primary camp a majority of the legislators are cowards as well as criminals. If the people can be convinced of their criminality their indignation will compel a final manifestation of cowardice. If enough popular passion can be produced, then the surrender of the Legislature to the direct primary bill will be assured. Hence the sudden outbreak of this campaign of virulence and violence.

THE SUN does not believe such a campaign can succeed. It does not believe that any considerable portion of the people of this State are fools, or that any large fraction of the members of the Legislature are cowardly knaves. On the contrary it believes that the campaign now undertaken is of the sort that discredits itself, is too transparent to command credence among the most credulous. Already in the expression of the press and the people of this State it has been enough to be satisfied that the direct primary campaign, for the present at least, is a spent effort.

For the prompt termination of the vicious and futile campaign, however, there are practical reasons. In the past four years of reform administration and moral awakening the cost of State government has increased nearly 50 per cent., an increase only partly concealed by jugglery with canal payment last year. It was \$30,000,000 in 1906; it was \$40,000,000 last year, despite the juggling; advance reports from Albany indicate that it will be \$44,000,000 this year. The return to the direct tax abolished by ODELL has been insured by HUGHES. The Legislature is still in session in May and a June adjournment is certain, where a June adjournment came in early April.

The truth is the game is up. The people of this State are not in a mood to believe the interested self-advertisers when they assert that the Governor has betrayed his cause. Nor are they now likely to credit the impudent assertion that the Legislature has sold out its constituents. It is time for these political sandwichmen to change boards, for the public has lost interest, the facts of State government have at last eliminated the phantoms. All that a weary electorate now asks of the Legislature is that it do its real work and quit. The habit of forecasting political annihilation for all legislators who vote against an important measure is too familiar and has too often been proved foolish to frighten any one. In the last phase of the direct primary fight all others are revealed, exposed, but even for that the time to end has come.

Why the Insurgents Are Not Interested. It may have been noticed by those interested in the matter that among the Republicans in Congress urging economy in appropriations the Insurgents are not conspicuous. The Senator who devoted many days to the preparation of a speech analyzing river and harbor bills and protesting against the wasteful method of voting money without regard to a scientific plan of construction was the Hon. THEODORE BURTON of Ohio. He is not an Insurgent. The most persistent and the most unyielding advocate

of economy in the House is the Hon. JAMES A. TAWNEY, who has been marked for slaughter by the Insurgents in Minnesota. It is true that Mr. TAWNEY is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but thrift has always been his hobby and he has made a great many enemies by his plain speaking. It does not matter whether a Congress election is past or to come, his voice is always raised for careful expenditure.

It will be found that most of the Republican members who are visited by compunctions about the extravagance of billion dollar sessions are regulars. The Democrats are eliminated from consideration; the opposition always talks economy but is as active in the pursuit of post office and court house and waterway appropriations as the party in power. The busiest committee in the closing days of the Sixty-first Congress is that on public buildings and grounds; the siege of it is non-partisan. Democrats and Insurgents as well as regular Republicans crowd the doors, and we venture to say none of those who have designs on the Treasury is more of a nuisance to the committee at its wits' ends than the Insurgent. The reason is not far to seek. An Insurgent is not a hero and a martyr, as he would have the country believe. He tries to reflect the sentiment of the voters who sent him to Congress, and he is not above changing his convictions to retain his seat. If the people in his district are not satisfied with the Payne tariff law and the deeps are murmuring, he is or he will become a full-fledged Insurgent. It is obvious, then, that if they want a new court house or Canopus creek dredged for flatboats he will haunt the committee that can recommend the appropriation wanted.

There are no sticklers for economy among the Insurgents in Congress. There is nothing popular in the idea, at least locally. Moreover, economy is not sensational and arousing as an issue. For the purpose of publicity it does well enough in a platform, and as an opposition slogan it has its uses on the stump; but compared with the trusts, tariff slashing, conservation and predatory corporations it does not appeal to a full blooded Insurgent. We notice even in newspapers friendly to this class of Republican in Congress a regret that the Insurgents in the House and Senate have not had the prevision to embody economy in their platform and make a brave stand for it in Washington, since it is held to be the great issue of the future. Well, when there are any signs that the people are stirred up about economy and show a discontented and mutinous spirit, depend upon it the Insurgents will be heard in full cry.

The Exonerating Letter of September 13. That the President of the United States may with absolute propriety delegate to any person whom he may select for the task the preparation of documents, letters and what not, and that the productions of the person on whom his choice falls become when approved and formally set forth by the President official statements of the Chief Magistrate, for which he must accept full responsibility and for which he deserves entire credit, will not be seriously disputed. Certainly no business man who employs a stenographer, no lawyer whose clerks prepare papers for him to sign, no man in executive place who consigns parts of his correspondence to clerical assistants will dispute the proposition.

Obviously in the specific case that now engages attention Mr. TAFT did nothing calling for censure when he directed Mr. LAWLER to prepare "as if he were President" an opinion on the Glavis-Ballinger case, nor did he lay himself open to the faintest suspicion of wrongdoing when he incorporated parts of Mr. LAWLER'S production in a letter to which he affixed his own signature. It is unfortunate that the attitude which Mr. TAFT subsequently assumed or was put in is not equally free from criticism. When the stenographer to whom Mr. LAWLER dictated "an opinion as if he were President" made the charge that the letter signed by the President was composed by Mr. LAWLER, the answer that good sense and judgment would have dictated, in our opinion, was a complete acknowledgment of the clerical assistance given and an offer to lay bare the petty domestic and departmental history of the whole affair. Who among the President's advisers was so densely stupid as to imagine that such an acknowledgment would be received by the public as creditable to the Presidency or harmful to Mr. TAFT? Forty-eight hours ago we should have said that nobody in Washington could have harbored so grotesque a misconception; yet the first statement given out at the White House on May 14 after the publication of the Kerby affidavit contained these positive declarations:

"With reference to the published affidavit of F. M. KERBY, a stenographer in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, to the effect that the President's letter of September 13, 1909, exonerating Secretary BALLINGER, was substantially prepared for the President's signature by Assistant Attorney General LAWLER, it was said at the White House today that there is absolutely no foundation for any such statement."

"The President dictated his letter personally as the result of his own investigation of the record and consideration of documents and papers in his possession at the time and upon the report to him of the Attorney General."

Why was so unnecessary an equivocation injected into what would otherwise have been a perfectly harmless record? What explanation of so futile an evasion can be made in the face of the letter from President TAFT to Senator NELSON, under date of May 15, the day following this amazing denial, from which the subjoined sentences are taken:

"In the discussions of the second evening Mr. LAWLER, who was present at my suggestion, discussed the evidence at some length. I said to Mr. LAWLER that I was very anxious to write a full statement of the case and set out the reasons for my decision, but that the time for my departure on a long Western trip, occupying two months, was just one week from that day; that he had some six or seven sets of speeches to deliver at

the beginning of that journey, and that I could not give the time to the preparation of such a detailed statement and opinion as I would like to render in the matter. I therefore requested Mr. LAWLER to prepare an opinion as if he were President."

"During the day I examined the draft opinion of Mr. LAWLER, but its thirty pages did not state the case in the way in which I wished it stated. It contained references to the evidence which were useful, but its criticism of Mr. PINCHOT and Mr. GLAVIS I did not think it proper or wise to adopt. I only used a few paragraphs from it containing merely general statements."

Is not the statement of May 14 qualified materially and partially contradicted by the letter of May 15? Could there be a more proper task for a subordinate than that performed by Mr. LAWLER? Could any sane man, regardless of his personal or political prejudices, find the slightest reason, excuse or justification for criticism of the President's conduct as described in this letter? Why then the incorrect and misleading statement of May 14? Why particularly when the unfortunate episode of the antedated Wickersham report was fresh in mind?

The Price of Potatoes.

The various commissions engaged in investigating the cost of living have a glorious opportunity to serve their fellow citizens by an illumination of the potato question. While the people of the Eastern cities have been paying from 30 to 75 cents a bushel for this wholesome food substance hundreds and probably thousands of carloads have been left to rot in the West for lack of a market. The Springfield Republican recently printed a letter from Greeley, Col., in which it was said that at that point alone 600 carloads were left to rot. The price there was 10 to 15 cents a bushel. Unassorted lots were being sold at 9 cents a bushel. In his speech defending the tariff last Thursday Representative SHREVE E. PAYNE said that in his district, within a few hours ride from New York city, "potatoes are selling at 20 cents a bushel."

The local surplus of potatoes is due to an enormous crop last year. The waste of the product is due to fault somewhere in the system of distribution. The normal crop of recent years has been about 300,000,000 bushels. The crop of 1909 was 367,000,000 bushels, which is 25 per cent. above the average for the five year period 1904-1908. Some where in the country there was a market for every bushel at a fair price. The extent of the supply was known at least as long ago as last November. The figures for the crop of last year are taken from the report of Secretary WILSON dated November 30, 1909.

The investigation of such a condition would seem to be quite in the line of the work of some of the various bodies engaged in effort to locate the specific causes of the high prices of commodities. In a time of abnormal yield, which should have resulted in cheaper prices for potatoes, the consumers appear to have been obliged to pay almost if not quite the prices charged when the crop is normal.

Law for Governor.

It is difficult to imagine a season more propitious than the autumn of 1910 for the nomination by the Republican party of SETH LOW for Governor. The Hon. SETH LOW would have all the pleasure of the campaign and the State would be in no danger of suffering from his administration of its affairs. His defeat would cause regret to nobody, would wreck no promising career, would affect no important political interest.

The Bloomington Poet.

We welcome to Arcady Mr. JOHN F. MYERS of Bloomington, Ill., whose works are printed in a charming little volume bound in red and bearing the modest title "Poems." Mr. MYERS is a man of dignified appearance, with evidence of his good Dutch descent. From the biographical sketch which introduces the volume and from the genealogical notes which close the two hundred pages we learn that this poet was born seventy-six years ago in Kentucky. He and the Hon. ADLAI STEVENSON drank from the same sparkling educational spring in Bloomington. He tells us that he could not see money in poetry and music (his father played the fife), and so he "stuck to the farm, writing an occasional poem or instrumental piece of music when the muses would bring the inspiration so strong that it would boil over of its own momentum."

The family ties are strong in Mr. MYERS, and he makes no excuse for including in his volume tributes in verse to members of his family. In the stanzas to "My dear little family" he sings:

With silent face, and voices sweet, on ocean play, They played superbly and complete, and Blandwell sang approval. While Cona played the instrument and sang the air completely. Their Fa sang bass, and dear ESTRELLA sang the alto sweetly.

Many other members of the family are remembered in verse, including Mr. MYERS'S brother-in-law, WILLIAM CRUIKSHANK, who, as we learn, "was suddenly killed by a pair of mules and was an exemplary man." The poet's father was not a tyro in the field of letters, although few of his productions survive. Of a son killed on the railroad in middle life he writes:

When I held the field of letters thou didst soar, It was a good one who could thus surpass. When thou didst view thy foremost o'er Thou stood among the foremost in thy class.

the field of counsel the volume strikes no uncertain note. The difficult query "Where is hell?" is answered thus:

"Where rum and brandy, whiskey, beer, Is sold and drunk through license fair. The hottest hell we have is here. For there's a burning hell."

Heaven to the poet's view is a place to which we all may hope to go:

"The friendship for all when we are met. No matter where, or when we meet, And help to guide the indiscreet. Of such, of such is heaven."

The poet has much of sense relating to tobacco, for he says:

"And if my husband did begin, After the knot was tied, I'd call for a divorce from him And out of that I'd slide."

Indeed, all Mr. MYERS'S versification touches upon the practical, as the titles of poems indicate: "The Pseudo-Christian," "We All Wear Cloaks," "The Girl and What She Likes," "Guard Well Thy Thoughts," "Watch the Tide and Hustle" and "Compend of the Doctrine of Predestination."

In these poems there is much to admire, for the aims of JOHN F. MYERS are high and his diction is clear and forceful; but Mr. MYERS has really contributed to our knowledge of pioneer life in his historical poems entitled "Pioneers and Early Days in Illinois," "Bloomington, the Evergreen City" and in some excellent verses entitled "Pioneers of Livingston County." In these verses he gives accurate accounts of old costumes and habits which men of the East too readily forget. He also preserves for all time the entire list of settlers, grouped by years and wrought into his stanzas with skill worthy of HOMER. Examples of such variety must be given to illustrate properly the precise yet interesting contents of these poems:

"The people built houses of logs for a starter. Made cradles for shilbies to cover them o'er. The cracks chinked with clay mixed with straw for a mortar. And logs split in punch-bowls were laid for a floor. This country, a paradise then for the hunter. For deer, grouse and turkey then roamed o'er the hills; The pioneer's larder was filled in the winter. With savory meat from the game that he killed."

After a good description of wolves and snakes he continues:

"The hog was quite ancient, his back like a razor. His nose was so sharp he could drink from a jug. The cattle were fair, and a very good grazer. A few small animals, but most of them plig. Too light for hard draught, heavy roads and hard wheeling. But some were so fleet as the earth ever tread. The ox was more patient, less nervous, less feeling. And used on the prairies to break up the sod."

Space will not allow for quotations which refer to cook stoves, buggies, maple sap and school days with ADLAI E. STEVENSON. This sketch may close with quotations which illustrate the historical method:

"In '30 this beautiful country was booming. About fifty families lived 'round the grove; In '33 Bloomington started its booming. And slowly but surely it still on the move. The pioneer doctors were WHEELER and BAKER. With HAINES and Doc ANDERSON; all came to stay. The age was common, a terrible shaker. And hard to get rid of in that early day."

Of the many stanzas which carry their burden of proper names the following relate to the year just referred to. They are typical and form a fitting conclusion:

"THE YEAR '31 came DAVE NOBLE and brother. A. GRIMLEY, GRANT, LARSON, IKE TRIMBLE. THE STEWARTS, JAMES SHROOP, the HOOGHANS and others. ABE CARROLL and WARREN, all good men indeed."

Altogether a notable addition to the catalogue of the birds whom THE SUN delights to celebrate.

Timid folk who have been alarmed by scientific opinion concerning the designs of the Hallelujah comet upon the earth will be reassured by the judgment of Professor CARL E. MYERS, the astronomer, that the comet has no tail. In a statement issued by the professor from Ballou Farm, Frankfurt, N. Y., he says:

"A comet's tail is that portion of a comet's atmosphere or attenuated substance surrounding a comet's nucleus made visible by the sun's rays converging by the comet's mass acting as a lens to project concentrated sunshine in the line with the shadow of the comet's nucleus, or denser central portion. It is not a 'tail' but a portion of a 'vaporous sphere' revealed."

Therefore, if the comet has no tail the earth cannot be whisked by it nor can the earth be depopulated by cyanogen gas. We are not sure that the exposition of Professor MYERS is entirely clear, but as the astronomers disagree and admit that they do not know just what will happen on Wednesday night, there is comfort in the scepticism of the professor. No one fears a tailless comet.

The collapse of the Pueblo Indian "uprising" indicates that the property in dispute is not worth a white man's fighting for at this time.

THE PINCHOT-GARFIELD CAMPAIGN.

From the Washington letter of A. Maurice Lee to the National Review of London.

The investigation of the charges brought by Mr. Pinchot, the former chief forester, against Mr. Ballinger, the Secretary of the Interior, which has been in progress for the last two months and may last no one knows how much longer, has lost all interest for the public because it has long been seen that Mr. Pinchot had no ground for his accusations against Mr. Ballinger and the great animosities that were promised have not materialized. It will be remembered that Mr. Ballinger was arraigned for having improperly permitted the acquisition of immensely valuable mining lands by a syndicate, and it was intimated that his motives were corrupt and that he was unfit to be a member of the Cabinet. The President was compelled to dismiss Mr. Pinchot because he brought these charges, but because he was insubordinate and reflected upon the President. Mr. Pinchot, who is a man of large wealth which he inherited from his father, assisted by Mr. Garfield, Mr. Roosevelt's Secretary of the Interior, has carried on an active campaign to discredit Mr. Taft's administration.

Both Mr. Pinchot and Mr. Garfield have appeared before the joint Congressional Committee appointed to conduct the investigation, but neither has been able to prove his case, much to the disappointment of their partisans, who confidently expected amazing revelations that would drive Mr. Ballinger out of the Cabinet, rehabilitate Mr. Pinchot and make Mr. Garfield a popular idol. Nothing of the kind has happened. Both men made a bad impression in the witness chair. Mr. Pinchot before testifying read a statement of what he proposed to prove. It was really an indictment of Secretary Ballinger and justified all that had been said of Mr. Ballinger's infidelity, but Mr. Pinchot, like Mr. Garfield, later, "thought" and "believed" and was "under the impression," but neither was able to produce evidence damaging to Mr. Ballinger's reputation.

Mr. Pinchot is highly respected for his excellent intentions, but he is a theoretic extremist who is so carried away by his ideals that he is apt to do injustice to any one who does not agree with him, and, like all men of an unassuming nature, easily imposed upon. Consequently there is all the more regret that Mr. Pinchot, who has been a useful public servant, should have given encouragement to Mr. Ballinger's detractors and taken part in an agitation for which there was no warrant.

Venerable Authorship.

From the Springfield Republican. Presidents are the hardest worked men in the United States, and it would be inconceivable cruelty to require them to compose every line of their state papers. What they adopt as their own and sign, however, becomes theirs, even if it were written by a subordinate. Alexander Hamilton wrote President George Washington's farewell address, but that fact makes it no less George Washington's. Gifford Pinchot is said to have written President Roosevelt's veto of the James River dam bill, but that fact makes the veto message no less Mr. Roosevelt's.

INDICTING THE BOYS.

Their Behavior Examined With a Thought for Their Future. To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—It is not a question of whether boys are no worse or no better in this day than they were a generation or two ago, but how to make them better behaved, better educated, better mannered than they are now. No one objects to youthful enthusiasm. Allowances will always be made for the inexperience of youth and there is always to be hoped that our youngsters will grow up to be good citizens; but we do object to ball playing in our streets, with the din that accompanies it. We do object to horseplay and vicious mischievousness, to damage done to public and private property, to the utter dislike and indifference to law, order, peace and quietness manifested by the boys of good homes.

Colonel Jones of New Jersey has the wrong notion, probably based on his own youthful reminiscences. Perhaps the boys he knows are all well behaved and act like little gentlemen. He will hope so, and also hope they will not be boys who are bad and growing up unchecked and untrained. He evidently would let boys do as they please in their play, and that they will in time grow up to be colonels and vice versa. Some of the boys I have met mistake impudence for independence, license for liberty. They are the sort of boys who will develop into poor types of men, citizens of no special value to the world. NEW YORK, MAY 16.

Introducing Mr. Givensham Wilson.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—In Delaware, a small town about eighteen or twenty miles from here, lives Givensham Wilson. Givensham is a cobbler from necessity, but from choice he is a checker board player, and he has over his door evidently a handsome sign bears the picture of a checkerboard and these lines:

Your shoes robbed free If you win a game from me. True to his word, Givensham is never so busy to oblige stranger or giveadvice with a game. He told me that the scheme was a very good one, but I must always say:

Seeming confidential, he said that he was a member of the "Victory" club, but being asked the advantages of such a club, he strenuously denied, he adopted his present name partly for business reasons and partly because his paternal and maternal ancestors were named "Victory" and "Givensham," though he suggested to me just the names were adopted, but he has received permission of the County Court to use the name.

Inside the shop another sign, evidently made on the top of large corals, informs an anxious public that Givensham is a first class check player, but this latter sign he said was somewhat of a trial, for it took a great deal of his time explaining the meaning of the word "checkmate" to him. Givensham also informed me that he was a great lover of Shakespeare. O. J. A. COLUMBUS, Ohio, May 15.

Forget the Church for the Sempster.

From the Pall Mall Gazette. A Member of the clergyman once displayed his prowess in the same way as the minister of the Church of England, I did know the man who, Bishop Fraser wrote to the fighting parson a letter of reproof, pointing out (among other things) that, as the Church of England was a member of the clergyman, he should be very careful in his denunciations. The offender replied by saying: "I must regretfully admit that, being grossly insulted, and forgetting in the heat of the moment the critical position of the Church of England, I did know the man who, Fraser, according to Mr. Bryce, who tells the story, possessed more than the average Bishop's share of humor, and was so delighted at this turning of the tables that he invited the clergyman to stay with him."

Why He Was Not in the Cabinet.

From the London Globe. Lord Beaconsfield, in forming one of his Cabinets, omitted to include a distinguished Scottish statesman. The omission was brought under the notice of the Prime Minister, who dismissed the matter in character. "Oh, no," he said, "we cannot have him—in the Cabinet. He means too much. We will send him to the Assembly," and to the Assembly he went.

At the Games.

Editor:—The out of foot has been up. Bishop—But it doesn't count any more, to sell the home plate with 200 yards of foot.

FOOD PRICES.

Conclusions of a Business Man Learned in the Milling and Wheat Trade.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: I am forced in the conclusion that much contained in your article of May 14 "Those Cheaper Markets" was written under an entirely wrong impression or from false information. Having been in the flour milling business all of my business life, I have naturally made a careful study of wheat conditions and wheat prices. The price of wheat in the United States is entirely regulated by the world's supply you are only partly correct. It is a fact that you can buy very good Canadian flour delivered here in New York, in bond for export, at \$4.50 a barrel, when flour of equal quality cannot possibly be made in this country for \$5.00 a barrel to-day. This should be sufficient proof for the contention of the advocates of the free introduction of Canadian wheat into the United States, that it will very much cheapen the bread of the consumers of the United States. The milling business of this country is managed with the greatest skill and care on the part of the miller. The industry of like magnitude, and the difference in the price of Canadian flour as against that of American flour is not a profit to the miller but is only a loss to the consumer. If it were not for the duty of \$1 a barrel on flour and 30 cents a bushel on wheat, American people could not afford to buy the duty of 75 cents a bushel, imported Canadian wheat and sold the product in competition with flour made from American wheat at a profit. The duty paid on wheat by the American consumer had to pay, and it could have been saved to him if it were not for our unreasonable tariff.

If the American miller had access to the Canadian wheat fields he could also very profitably sell his surplus of business transactions to the consumer by the cheapening of the mill flour, which would result in cheaper bread for the consumer. The fact that a larger majority of American farmers would benefit from this than from the duty of 75 cents a bushel, is a fact that is not to be overlooked. The duty on wheat from 8 to 10 cents a pound less than in Detroit.

My own life in the milling business, I am not much conversant with relative prices on other food products. I have heard only of the fact that American meat has been imported from Argentina, the duty and freight paid on the same, and sold in competition with the American sheep, setting a large profit over the American sheep. This I judge that other life's necessities would also be cheapened to working people, but it would be removed from all food products.

If newspaper writers who have the best interests of our people at heart, would be guided by information gained from business people who are giving all their thought and energy to the problem, such as the argument of politicians, or poor working people would soon see a large change for free Canadian wheat that our registers at Washington would have to give it to us and also give us access to other cheap foods which is now barred out by that imaginary tariff. CLEMENT S. STRICK. NEW YORK, MAY 15.

Conclusions of a Student of the Protective System.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: In your editorial article "Those Cheaper Markets" you take the ground that it would be materially affected: prices of food-stuffs in this country if the tariff were taken off the free list. Without going into details as to prices, it is not true that it is good business to buy in the cheapest market; that it is a sound economic principle that our present competitive system demands the freest competition as to both goods and services, and that it is not so much that matter any tariff, free and fair competition is not possible; that the more sources of supply the greater the competition to supply or sell, and the freer the trade and the fewer the burdens placed on imports the greater the demand and the better the service to the consumer. The fact that we are primarily the result of restricted supply in a "protected" country?

You say "the theory of material reductions through transfer of all food products to the free list is distinctly fallacious. Such a course would not be materially helpful so far as the consumer is concerned, and not appreciably harmful so far as producers are concerned. The effect on the national revenue, except in the case of sugar, would be inconsiderable." Now comes the saving clause, and I think if you had predicated your argument on it as a fundamental fact you would have reached a different conclusion. "A possible and it may be a probable influence, would lie in a tendency to steady prices on some commodities." Exactly so. And what is more effective in steadying prices than competition, insuring as it does more constant supply and the few "corners" which are primarily the result of restricted supply in a "protected" country?

You say that the duty of one and one-half cents on sugar, and the duty of one cent on pork should not discourage the production of these articles, but you must consider that it is a price which is not so much as it is not appreciably harmful so far as producers are concerned. The effect on the national revenue, except in the case of sugar, would be inconsiderable. Now comes the saving clause, and I think if you had predicated your argument on it as a fundamental fact you would have reached a different conclusion. "A possible and it may be a probable influence, would lie in a tendency to steady prices on some commodities." Exactly so. And what is more effective in steadying prices than competition, insuring as it does more constant supply and the few "corners" which are primarily the result of restricted supply in a "protected" country?

You say that the duty of one and one-half cents on sugar, and the duty of one cent on pork should not discourage the production of these articles, but you must consider that it is a price which is not so much as it is not appreciably harmful so far as producers are concerned. The effect on the national revenue, except in the case of sugar, would be inconsiderable. Now comes the saving clause, and I think if you had predicated your argument on it as a fundamental fact you would have reached a different conclusion. "A possible and it may be a probable influence, would lie in a tendency to steady prices on some commodities." Exactly so. And what is more effective in steadying prices than competition, insuring as it does more constant supply and the few "corners" which are primarily the result of restricted supply in a "protected" country?

You say that the duty of one and one-half cents on sugar, and the duty of one cent on pork should not discourage the production of these articles, but you must consider that it is a price which is not so much as it is not appreciably harmful so far as producers are concerned. The effect on the national revenue, except in the case of sugar, would be inconsiderable. Now comes the saving clause, and I think if you had predicated your argument on it as a fundamental fact you would have reached a different conclusion. "A possible and it may be a probable influence, would lie in a tendency to steady prices on some commodities." Exactly so. And what is more effective in steadying prices than competition, insuring as it does more constant supply and the few "corners" which are primarily the result of restricted supply in a "protected" country?

You say that the duty of one and one-half cents on sugar, and the duty of one cent on pork should not discourage the production of these articles, but you must consider that it is a price which is not so much as it is not appreciably harmful so far as producers are concerned. The effect on the national revenue, except in the case of sugar, would be inconsiderable. Now comes the saving clause, and I think if you had predicated your argument on it as a fundamental fact you would have reached a different conclusion. "A possible and it may be a probable influence, would lie in a tendency to steady prices on some commodities." Exactly so. And what is more effective in steadying prices than competition, insuring as it does more constant supply and the few "corners" which are primarily the result of restricted supply in a "protected" country?

You say that the duty of one and one-half cents on sugar, and the duty of one cent on pork should not discourage the production of these articles, but you must consider that it is a price which is not so much as it is not appreciably harmful so far as producers are concerned. The effect on the national revenue, except in the case of sugar, would be inconsiderable. Now comes the saving clause, and I think if you had predicated your argument on it as a fundamental fact you would have reached a different conclusion. "A possible and it may be a probable influence, would lie in a tendency to steady prices on some commodities." Exactly so. And what is more effective in steadying prices than competition, insuring as it does more constant supply and the few "corners" which are primarily the result of restricted supply in a "protected" country?

You say that the duty of one and one-half cents on sugar, and the duty of one cent on pork should not discourage the production of these articles, but you must consider that it is a price which is not so much as it is not appreciably harmful so far as producers are concerned. The effect on the national revenue, except in the case of sugar, would be inconsiderable. Now comes the saving clause, and I think if you had predicated your argument on it as a fundamental fact you would have reached a different conclusion. "A possible and it may be a probable influence, would lie in a tendency to steady prices on some commodities." Exactly so. And what is more effective in steadying prices than competition, insuring as it does more constant supply and the few "corners" which are primarily the result of restricted supply in a "protected" country?

You say that the duty of one and one-half cents on sugar, and the duty of one cent on pork should not discourage the production of these articles, but you must consider that it is a price which is not so much as it is not appreciably harmful so far as producers are concerned. The effect on the national revenue, except in the case of sugar, would be inconsiderable. Now comes the saving clause, and I think if you had predicated your argument on it as a fundamental fact you would have reached a different conclusion. "A possible and it may be a probable influence, would lie in a tendency to steady prices on some commodities." Exactly so. And what is more effective in steadying prices than competition, insuring as it does more constant supply and the few "corners" which are primarily the result of restricted supply in a "protected" country?

You say that the duty of one and one-half cents on sugar, and the duty of one cent on pork should not discourage the production of these articles, but you must consider that it is a price which is not so much as it is not appreciably harmful so far as producers are concerned. The effect on the national revenue, except in the case of sugar, would be inconsiderable. Now comes the saving clause, and I think if you had predicated your argument on it as a fundamental fact you would have reached a different conclusion. "A possible and it may be a probable influence, would lie in a tendency to steady prices on some commodities." Exactly so. And what is more effective in steadying prices than competition, insuring as it does more constant supply and the few "corners" which are primarily the result of restricted supply in a "protected" country?

You say that the duty of one and one-half cents on sugar, and the duty of one cent on pork should not discourage the production of these articles, but you must consider that it is a price which is not so much as it is not appreciably harmful so far as producers are concerned. The effect on the national revenue, except in the case of sugar, would be inconsiderable. Now comes the saving clause, and I think if you had predicated your argument on it as a fundamental fact you would have reached a different conclusion. "A possible and it may be a probable influence, would lie in a tendency to steady prices on some commodities." Exactly so. And what is more effective in steadying prices than competition, insuring as it does more constant supply and the few "corners" which are primarily the result of restricted supply in a "protected" country?

You