

Subscription to West Postage... THE SUN, 100 NASSAU ST., N. Y. C.

THE SUN'S NEW YORK OFFICE... THE SUN'S NEW YORK OFFICE... THE SUN'S NEW YORK OFFICE...

The Old Nationalism and the "New"

Mr. IVINS' letter not only exhibits in clear light the revolutionary aspect of Colonel Roosevelt's "new nationalism," but also it measures precisely the extent of that agitator's ignorance of the value and meaning of those decisions of the Supreme Court which he denounces, and the gross impropriety of such denunciation with reference to pending cases. This analysis will be studied with uncommon interest by all concerned, and what citizen has not deep concern in the destructive enterprise, the scurrying defiance of constitutional law, the un-American theory of executive supremacy proclaimed at Osawatimie by another citizen who has been President of the United States?

We have been asked to tell more plainly THE SUN'S reasons for supporting that when Colonel Roosevelt demands a radical change in the American system of government in the form of a "new nationalism" he is not in fact merely contemplating the regular process of constitutional amendment instead of depending upon that doctrine of inherent sovereignty and unexpressed powers which the Supreme Court disposed of in the Kansas-Colorado decision. Our reasons are these:

First, "new nationalism" would be deprived of any but an academic interest to the public and likewise of all sensational and contemporaneous interest to Colonel Roosevelt himself if change by constitutional amendment were his project. Everybody knows that the old nationalism, the American form of government which had been in successful operation for about seventy years when Colonel Roosevelt came into being, may be altered in any particular but one by amending the Constitution. The single exception is that no State without its consent shall be deprived of equal suffrage in the Senate by constitutional amendment. It is a mere commonplace to say that any other modification of the existing system, even to the election of a President for life by popular vote, might be accomplished if the amendment could be ratified by the necessary number of States.

Secondly, Colonel Roosevelt is saying nothing about constitutional amendment as the proposed route to the "new nationalism." We cannot put so low an estimate on his intelligence and courage as to believe that if constitutional amendments were now in his mind he would studiously avoid any reference to so important a detail.

In the third place, Colonel Roosevelt has already expressed his views on the method of extending Federal power. In his speech at Harrisburg on October 4, 1906, after reciting the evils due to insufficient power at Washington, he said: "These evils must be grappled with by governmental action. In some cases this governmental action must be supplied by the several States individually. In yet others, it is becoming increasingly evident that no efficient action is possible and that we need through executive action, through legislation, and through judicial interpretation and construction of law, to increase the power of the Federal Government."

President Roosevelt proceeded at Harrisburg, on the strength of his somewhat imperfect understanding of the views held in the early days of the republic by Pennsylvania's great jurist on the Supreme bench, Mr. Justice JAMES WILSON, to develop the substance of the doctrine of inherent and unexpressed powers which the lawyers of his Administration presented to the Supreme Court in the Kansas-Colorado case. This doctrine of "new nationalism" has been utterly demolished by the tribunal's far-reaching decision of 1907, the essential part of which THE SUN printed yesterday.

The French Republic

It is a queer turn of fate that the only survivors among the chief actors in the revolution of forty years ago in France should be the Empress EUGENIE, who fled on that September 4 from a Paris mob, infuriated by the news of Sedan, EMILE OLLIVIER, the Minister who entered on the war with a light heart, and HENRI ROCHERFORT of La Lanterne, who was foremost in inciting the people against the Second Empire. All the Generals who led the desperate defense against the Prussian invasion are gone of the self-constituted Government of Defense, JULES FAYRE, JULES SIMON, GAMBETTA and the rest, none is left save the man who turned against them and joined the Commune.

There are some of the government leaders who have been the victims of the revolution. Some of them were in the army, some in the navy, some in the magistrature. With the exception of the latter, with nothing but defeat and disaster to show for their efforts, they were all ruined. The only one who was not ruined was the Emperor himself. He had no other resources. He had no other resources. He had no other resources.

France has progressed steadily and France has occupied her high place in Europe. She has indulged in kaleidoscopic changes of Ministers, shifting a rather small number of men about almost incessantly, she has given some fairly great men and a lot of little men the chance to govern her, she has put in the Presidential chair honest men, who have left office, with a single exception, with as good reputations as they brought to it. She has withstood the temptations of demagogues and military adventurers, she has remained steady, regardless of men, exhibiting the characteristic French good sense which surpasses prejudiced foreigners.

France has steered clear of foreign complications having invariably selected men of experience and ability to conduct her foreign affairs. She has increased her colonial empire and improved its administration, she has managed home matters to the general satisfaction of the French people, and these have included the grave question of separating State and Church and that of holding the arrogance of the military element within bounds. She faces now the demands of the socialists with as much force and at least as much intelligence as Germany and Great Britain display.

A prosperous and progressive republic, on friendly terms with all her neighbors, an example that monarchical institutions are not necessary in Europe, France holds a place among the nations to-day that no Frenchman could have dreamed of in that "terrible year" forty years ago. That she may continue so is the wish of every American.

The Census

One fact stands out beyond all others in the results of the recent census in this city. For the first time the population of the city of New York unmistakably exceeds that of the remainder of the State. Although the figures for the other counties of the State are still lacking, the following table indicates the certainty that a majority of the population of the State now lives in the four counties that make up the greater city.

Table with 3 columns: City, 1900, 1910. Rows: New York, Kings, Queens, Richmond.

That the city of New York was certain at no remote time to pass the remainder of the State has been realized by thoughtful politicians for some years. Nevertheless the political effects of this change are bound to be considerable both at once and hereafter. This immediately the effect will be felt in the reapportionment for members of Congress. Under the last Federal census the districts outside of the city were represented by nineteen members of Congress, or twenty if the Suffolk, Nassau, Queens, district be counted, as compared with seventeen from the city. In the next apportionment twenty-four members will fall to New York city and not more than twenty-two to the balance of the State if the same ratio can change the supremacy of the city over the State.

With the reapportionment, moreover, the seat of control of the Republican party changes. The Republican State committee is made up of a member from each Congress district. Rural New York holds twenty of the thirty-seven seats under the present apportionment. Under the next New York city will hold at least twenty-four of forty-six, without reference to the delegate at large, who is also a resident of this city. Henceforth, therefore, if the Republicans of New York city are united they will control the executive machinery of the Republican party in the State, unless the present method of choosing State committee men is abandoned.

So far as the Democratic party is concerned the change will be less immediate, since the Democratic State committee is based upon Senate districts. Yet under the last State apportionment 22 of the 51 Senate districts were wholly or in major part within the boundaries of this city. A constitutional inhibition prevents any one county from having more than one-third of the members, or any two adjoining counties more than one-half. Yet the rapid expansion of Queens opens the way to the control of the Senate by this city based upon the combined strength of the members from Kings, New York and Queens counties.

City control of the Assembly is even more a distant possibility than that of the Senate, for of the 150 members no less than 50 are at once assigned to the several counties outside of New York, each of which is entitled to at least one member. Yet in the present Assembly New York city has 63 members, or but 13 less than a majority, while the number of rural counties represented formerly by more than one member has been steadily decreasing with every census.

In the State an inevitable consequence of the supremacy of the city over the State is population, a supremacy which the figures for most New York will unmistakably demonstrate to be complete and decisive. Moreover the rate of progress of the city population is compared with that of the remainder of the State, demonstrates that at the next census the disparity will considerably be relatively increased.

Difficulties in the calculation of the actual consequences of the situation are to be expected, but the elements which are excluded from the calculation in State apportionments. The census of 1900 revealed the presence of upward of 1,000,000 persons approximately 500,000 in the city and 500,000 in the rest of the State. Yet even this advantage now with the next State census if the present rate of growth in rural and metropolitan districts is maintained.

The simple fact is that with the census figures of 1910 at hand it is easy to recognize that the political center of gravity of the State has shifted. State Government from Esopus, Newburgh or Albany may still be possible for up-State politicians if the citizens of this town permit it or accept it with characteristic resignation. Yet now as never before the city can if it chooses rule the State, or at least compel the State to permit it to administer its own affairs without that interference which has been for so many years the cause of continued but unimportant protest.

The Demand for Music

When the arts of musical virtuosity mobiled abroad for its annual advance on the United States some time next month its numbers will be found much smaller than usual. It rarely happens that public and artists have so full a year as the last was. It was indeed the case of the preceding swarm of musical artists that accounts for the diminished numbers of the coming year.

For managers and performers have learned that this country in spite of its fertile plains and its rich mines, still knows some limit to its power to spend money for the pleasure of listening to concerts. The oversupply of music in New York last year has led to an extensive curtailment of the amount to be offered in the coming season. Instead of three opera houses there will be one. The number of symphony concerts will be diminished. As fewer musical celebrities are coming there will be fewer concerts. In every way there will be an attempt to get back to some reasonable, businesslike basis.

Not only in New York has this condition of oversupply existed, for several years. Last year surprising reports reached town of the small audiences attracted to hear artists of the foremost reputation here and in Europe. This was not always a reflection on the ability to interest the public, more frequently it was an indication of the expenditure of all the money that this or that particular town had for investment in musical pleasures. It was not possible for every one of the musicians who came along later found the cupboard bare. The lesson has not been without its effect on the musical managers and their principals. They are quick to learn when the loss of money and reputation is at stake. The preponderating interest in opera, to judge by present indications is another cause of their willingness to remain away from the golden shores of this country for another year.

This it happens that there will be heard next winter only two pianists of the very first rank as they are known here. Some of the newcomers may develop talents as yet unsuspected, but they are not of the small company of the select in the world of music. The supply of violinists is proportionately smaller, and so on down through the ranks. The wisdom of this course cannot be questioned. The prudent music-makers who are staying at home this year may reap the reward of self-sacrifice in the greater success that will come to them after the public has had an opportunity to recover from satiety caused by the excess of music in recent years.

Hotels and Their Names

The rapid increase in the number of New York hotels in the last ten years put a severe strain on the imagination of their proprietors. Traces of their difficulties can be detected in the various repetitions of the same names for different houses. Only when they belong to different classes is such confusion not a source of inconvenience to the public. Two hotels in this town offer a striking instance of this. They are separated by a few blocks. One is among the foremost of the palaces that shelter vagrant wealth. The other has had more attention from the police than from connoisseurs in the art of living luxuriously. It must be said in favor of the latter place that it was first to take its name, which belongs to a family of importance in New York social and financial history. In spite of the difference in the character of these two places, they are known by precisely the same name. One of the hotels on the proudest corner of upper Broadway boasts a humble namesake on the East Side so remote in region as well as character that there is little likelihood of confusion.

Some degree of inconvenience is bound to result from this use of the same titles, although there are few cases in which the nominal identification between two different places has been so complete. Hotels of the same class are called by names so nearly similar, however, that their guests suffer unnecessary embarrassments in view of the wide field from which their proprietors might have selected striking and distinctive titles for their establishments.

There the best known in the country but earlier houses such as the Metropolitan and the Saint Nicholas have no successors. The old Astor House alone survives from that time, and with its open mansards keeps alive the practice of naming hotels after the families that own them. It was inevitable that such a custom should disappear, also some hotel names here would preponderate to an extent that would make it impossible to find them unless, like towers of a much humbler kind, they were distinguished by numbers as well.

London has sent more than one hotel designation to this city. Few, on the other hand, have come from Paris. Indian names were chosen upon with facility when apartment and other hotels began to become numerous. It is not easy to explain why in this scramble for some appropriate description the earlier and familiar names were overlooked.

It seems to me that you are counting on having the next President of the United States on your editorial staff, said some one, according to a current report, to the Hon. LARRY ARBETT of the Outlook. We mean nothing but a compliment when we thus stigmatize the respected name of the Hon. LAWRENCE F. ARBETT as the Teddy bear.

It is a pity that the Hon. HAZEL MANN (still missing a disarranged) was not present to supervise the Hon. LARRY ARBETT's English. The great question is not whether the Hon. LARRY ARBETT thinks "we will," but whether he thinks "we shall."

We congratulate Mr. WICKERMAN upon his discernment. If Congress could visit Alaska in a body perhaps something worth while would be done for that neglected Territory.

HERBERT BERRIDGEN THOR has just deluged London with one of those elaborate Shakespearean revivals that have disgraced the stage in spite of occasional outbursts against the actor-manager there must be confidence in one who shows so high a knowledge of and respect for his art. In New York the only Shakespearean promise of the season comes from actors who also manage their own business affairs. This year Mr. SOTHERN and Miss MARLOWE are to revive "Macbeth," altogether a labor of love probably, since it is one of the Shakespeare plays that appeal least potently to the public. EDWIN BOOTH produced it because he was fond of the title role. HENRY THORNTON's beautiful revival of it was among the most remarkable of the series of the Shakespearean productions that he brought to this city. There was small popular response. So Mr. SOTHERN and Miss MARLOWE may have to be satisfied with their artistic success.

The commercial managers seem disinclined to experiment with Shakespeare. Perhaps they have no confidence that New York will support them, if they make such artistic essays some other town is selected. When MAUDE ADAMS wants to act the heroine of SCHILLER'S "The Maid of Orleans" she repairs to the stadium of Harvard, when she appears as Rosalind, to the out-of-door theatre of the University of California. When MARJORIE ANGLIN plays in "Antigone" she selects the same academic stage. New York has to be satisfied with those pastoral plays that occasionally un-puck their "suit cases" on the campus of Columbia.

Miss HELEN DUBRETT, the French aviator, earned her reputation for womanly pluck and attitude with a passenger to-day. With a companion in her airplane Miss DUBRETT flew from New York to Brazil, a distance of about twenty-eight miles.

It is presumed the lady's companion was a man to help with the wheel and do other necessary things he was told to do, but it does not detract from the glory of her achievement. It seems almost like an argument for woman suffrage.

Days must be dark in a once prosperous profession when a railroad bandit is killed, as one was Friday in Colorado, by a "rook" thrown by the engineer of the train he had just "held up." Either bandits are less skillful or trainmen are departing from traditions, for the annals of highway robbery furnish no instance of a similar robbery and then revelled with his merry men in Sherwood Forest. PAUL CLIFFORD leaped on the rich traveller and was rewarded by the loss of a good woman. At times the law has been vented, there was death on Tyburn Hill, with all London to see the finish. In the glorious days of the JAMES and YONKER brothers engineers and trainmen, it is said, unconsciously held up their hands as they approached the famous Blue Cut and passengers closed the car windows and hid their valuables. With what dash and vigor safes were rifled then and passengers relieved of jewelry and pocketbooks. With sacks of booty and a parting fusillade of revolver shots the road agents made the swift night ride into the Clay county hills. Who would have ventured to resist? Who would have dreamed of such a thing as throwing stones, base, common "dornicks"?

There are other evidences, too, of the decline of the profession. Excelsior Springs, a Missouri watering place, decided some time ago no longer to vaunt itself upon its nearness to the former home of the JAMES brothers, and dropped a pilgrimage to that place from the list of excursions offered to visitors. COLG YONKER in his address to his old country hills, who would have ventured to resist? Who would have dreamed of such a thing as throwing stones, base, common "dornicks"?

There are other evidences, too, of the decline of the profession. Excelsior Springs, a Missouri watering place, decided some time ago no longer to vaunt itself upon its nearness to the former home of the JAMES brothers, and dropped a pilgrimage to that place from the list of excursions offered to visitors. COLG YONKER in his address to his old country hills, who would have ventured to resist? Who would have dreamed of such a thing as throwing stones, base, common "dornicks"?

REVOLUTION ON THE STUMP

Mr. William W. Allen of the "New Nationalism" and the Federal Courts. To the Editor of THE SUN: As preparatory to the announcement of his program for the "new nationalism" Mr. Roosevelt apparently believed it desirable to make an attack upon the Supreme Court of the United States. The program is so radical that it may be taken as the major part of his platform. We may study not only the frame of mind in which he came to the preparation, but also the history of the duties and of the relations to the other branches of the Government.

I do not believe it too much to say, although it may not appear so to the casual reader, that Mr. Roosevelt's theory is nevertheless revolutionary, and that his friends, at least those among them who are wise will regret it. The individual theory might be neglected if Mr. Roosevelt were a negligible person, but fortunately or unfortunately, as every American must decide for himself, he is not negligible.

If his remarks had been made by an untrained optimist in advocacy of progress without regard to order, any government would have passed unnoticed, because in that case the statement would have lacked the element of mischief-making. At the present time and under existing circumstances, and above all considering their authority, no serious student of history and of tendencies can read them without regret.

The matter has two aspects, first, that of the propriety of the attack upon the court at the present time and the manner in which the attack has been made; secondly as a theory of government.

As to the manner in which the attack has been made and its propriety, it seems to me to call attention to the fact that there are now pending before the Supreme Court of the United States two great cases growing out of the attempt on the part of the Government to apply the anti-trust law of 1906. I mean the cases of the Standard Oil Company and the Tobacco company, and no one can deny that both defendants are entitled to a fair and unimpaired trial.

In the argument in the tobacco case the Attorney-General insisted that the public is chiefly concerned about practical results, not mental attitudes.

This is true if the practical result be accomplished without sacrificing that mental attitude which insists that the law be applied as originally and coherently, disregarding of all animosity and in such a way as to protect and perpetuate the feeling for justice and equity, for the life of the law is infinitely more consequence than the punishment of any man whatever at the expense of the law itself.

In the same argument the Attorney-General insisted that the court should destroy the foundation of the existing unlawful power, thereby referring to the powers exercised by the Tobacco company which the Government contends are unlawful.

It is, however, for the courts to determine this precise question which the Government brings before them. If unlawful, then it is the act of Congress which destroys the foundation of the power. If the Congress, however, has not made such power unlawful, then there is no doubt about the fact that it is lawful and that the courts have no power to destroy it.

I make these quotations from the brief of the Attorney-General because they show that his frame of mind is apparently, so far as the argument in these cases is concerned, identical with that of Mr. Roosevelt, namely, that the courts and not Congress make the law. I shall come to that later, however, and it may not be untimely to recall the dissenting opinion in the Northern Securities case, where he recalls attention to a fact universally known and generally regarded by competent lawyers, and where he says:

Great cases, like hard cases, make bad law for great cases are laid great not by reason of their real importance in shaping the law of the future, but because of some accident of immediate overwhelming interest which appeals to the feelings and excites the judgment. These immediate interests obscure a kind of hydraulic pressure which makes what previously was clear seem doubtful, and before which even well settled principles of law will bend.

It seems to be the theory of the Government, and it is certainly the theory of Mr. Roosevelt, according to his last proffered statement, that these "accidents of immediate overwhelming interest" should take precedence of "settled principles of law," and that the Supreme Court of the United States should disregard such settled principles and accept the accidents of the immediate overwhelming interests as the determining rule, which is equivalent to saying that the administration of law should be a reflex of popular hysteria.

The mischievousness of Mr. Roosevelt's eruption at this time is due, I believe, primarily to the fact that his purpose is to create a state of feeling throughout the country which seeks to make it difficult for the Supreme Court to exercise its judgment undeterred in the final decision of the pending suits, and as such is, on Mr. Roosevelt's part, an act of terrorism directed to the court. It is noteworthy that Mr. Roosevelt has chosen for attack precisely those cases the principles involved in which are so clearly defined in the consideration of the cases at hand.

It is, however, useless to stop now to consider the why and the wherefore of the false impression which he has given of both the Knight case and the Lochner case. Whether it is his own impression and he lacks any feeling of responsibility for the avowal of such impressions at such a time, or whether there has been an ulterior purpose, the fact remains.

As to the Knight case, it was the first great case in which the question as to what constituted interstate commerce under the Sherman law was discussed. The determination revolved around the particular facts of the case as shown in the court, and if the Government was defeated it was because of its failure to prove its case, as has been demonstrated by subsequent cases in which the Government has succeeded. The Knight case, however, contains certain dicta which, if they now be finally adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States, would tend very largely to the determination of the litigations, particularly in the tobacco case, in favor of the defendant. It is unreasonable, therefore, to assume, given Mr. Roosevelt's temperament and frame of mind, that he has selected this case for attack with deliberate purpose. It is relied on as establishing certain propositions of law by counsel for the defendant. The Attorney-General, however, does not take the same view of its seriousness as Mr. Roosevelt does. He characterizes the case as one which is entirely without danger to the Government's claim, and scolds it in these words:

They drag out by their assistance in their case, the very worst, most absurd, most ignorant and most unscrupulous cases ever seen in the courts.

Now, it is quite apparent to everyone who is familiar with jurisprudence that Mr. Roosevelt either knows what the Knight case is, and in that case is guilty of an abuse in discussing it at the present time and in the manner in which he does, or that he does not know what it is, or at least does not know as well as the Supreme Court itself. Just what the case meant and what it decided, how far it is authoritative and how far it is likely to be followed, because it has not been followed in any of the cases which have come after it, the court itself has held on several occasions.

In the Transatlantic case, 108 U. S. 270, at page 319, Mr. Justice Peckham said: "The fact that the court did not apply its own rule engaged to one state in the setting of a case under the circumstances shown in the case of United States vs. Knight, 158 U. S. 1, is not a precedent, and the setting of a case under the circumstances shown in the case of United States vs. Knight, 158 U. S. 1, is not a precedent, and the setting of a case under the circumstances shown in the case of United States vs. Knight, 158 U. S. 1, is not a precedent."

In the Addition Pipe case, 155 U. S. 111, at page 120, Judge Peckham again said of the Knight case: "There was no intention or agreement in terms regarding the future disposition of the case, and the court's decision in the case of United States vs. Knight, 158 U. S. 1, is not a precedent, and the setting of a case under the circumstances shown in the case of United States vs. Knight, 158 U. S. 1, is not a precedent."

In Swift vs. U. S. (106 U. S. at page 307), Mr. Justice Holmes wrote that the subject matter of the combination in the Knight case was manufacture and the direct object monopoly of manufacture within a state. And in one of the latest cases, Loew vs. Lawlor, the court, referring to the Knight case, says specifically that it is the substance of the case, and that the question is not whether the case is a precedent, and the setting of a case under the circumstances shown in the case of United States vs. Knight, 158 U. S. 1, is not a precedent."

But simply because the Supreme Court found that the combination of Knight was not interstate commerce, it is not a precedent, and the setting of a case under the circumstances shown in the case of United States vs. Knight, 158 U. S. 1, is not a precedent."

The logic with, there is nothing in the Constitution or in our law which authorizes some large capital from small capitals which makes the contract of great things as distinguished from any other thing, that present function of the Government. Hence, this court, the doctrine of this effect. The court must not be the undisciplined body, did not exist in the granting the relief demanded by the Government. When, as I have said, the Government has presented facts which did justify granting the relief sought, the court has granted it, and it has been found that the law is efficient in its own right, and that it is not a precedent, and the setting of a case under the circumstances shown in the case of United States vs. Knight, 158 U. S. 1, is not a precedent."

This frame of mind shows clearly through his remarks in respect of the Lochner case to the effect that the Supreme Court has the negative power of not permitting a case to be remanded. The sole power is to determine whether or not there has been an abuse, and secondly, whether the law covers the abuse. The Supreme Court has no power to permit or not to permit anything, its sole power is to interpret the law and apply it as interpreted to the facts as presented. Mr. Roosevelt says: "No, and the courts at the theory of liberty is not to do with your person and your work as you will so long as it does not militate against the life of the community, notwithstanding the fact that this liberty is the fundamental consideration of the democratic struggle for the last 150 years."

So again he uses these words: "Their refusal to permit action by the state is reduced to impotence the only body which it has power." The Supreme Court of the United States has no discretion whatever in respect of permitting action by the State. It is not a permitting body, nor yet a body that can refuse to permit. Its function is to construe a State law and determine whether or not it falls within or without the provisions of the national Constitution looking to that very nationalism which Mr. Roosevelt is now advocating; and in this case, not believing itself to be a legislative body, and entertaining a very different theory of orderly government from that entertained by Mr. Roosevelt, it merely decided that the liberty protected by the Federal Constitution was impaired, and in view of the fact that the act was doubtful, that it should give "liberty" the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. Roosevelt concludes his attack by characterizing these two cases as being in "flagrant and direct contradiction to the spirit and needs of the times." The spirit and need of the times is, legally, possibly now more than ever before, if the Supreme Court is to usurp the function of Congress and adopt Mr. Roosevelt's personal view instead of the historic constitutional view, then the more hysterical and consequently the more dangerous the state of the public mind at a given moment, that hysteria is to be adjudicated into law in disregard of the permanent welfare of the nation.

Thus the ultimate and necessary implication of Mr. Roosevelt's teaching, and as such, as I said at the beginning, is nothing less than revolutionary. W. M. IVINS.

SELF-SUPPORT

Should It Be a Condition Precedent of Woman Suffrage? To the Editor of THE SUN: It was supposed to be impossible to find any argument other than the right of suffrage. Miss Moll Elliot Sewall, however, has found one. In a current magazine article she says that women must not vote because no voter can claim maintenance from another person. It is very common for one voter to be able to claim maintenance from another by virtue of a contract. From the farmer's hired man to the rich man's butler or steward, when a man lives on another's bounty, his vote is heard and his opinion is generally included in the contract. In the eye of the civil law marriage is a contract under which the wife acquires a right to maintenance for the support of herself and her children. As a general thing she fully earns it. The great majority of wives do their husband's housework besides bringing up the children. If the wife dies the widower has to begin at once paying out money to support his wife and her children. The wife's position is more like that of a steward or maid than that of a pauper, who loses his vote because he is supported by another man. He is not a pauper, but he is a pauper in the eye of the law. In fact the work she does, if she is at all a good mother, is much more valuable than that of a steward.

Miss Sewall says that if women get a vote they will lose their right as citizens. Experience does not bear this out. Women have been voting for forty years in Wyoming, for seven years in Colorado. And it has not occurred either to the Wyoming or Colorado legislatures to take away the vote from women. The right to vote is not a contract, but a right which is not subject to contract. As a general thing she fully earns it. The great majority of wives do their husband's housework besides bringing up the children. If the wife dies the widower has to begin at once paying out money to support his wife and her children. The wife's position is more like that of a steward or maid than that of a pauper, who loses his vote because he is supported by another man. He is not a pauper, but he is a pauper in the eye of the law. In fact the work she does, if she is at all a good mother, is much more valuable than that of a steward.

The greatest "Publicity Agent" To the Editor of THE SUN: Mr. Theodore Roosevelt is a shrewd man. When the political pot stops boiling the advertisement of the "African Game Trail" will fall on the ears of the millions. Mr. WEDDING, M. D. HAMPDEN, Va., September 1.

British Government Loan Proposed. Letter in the London Daily Mail. Sir, The following instructions are issued by His Majesty's stationery office with respect to the amount of gum supplied by them. In order to save the cost of the gum, and to obtain the best result is obtained by using the least amount of gum as will just insure the surface without leaving any white spots on the paper. The condition is that the gum must be of a quality which will not be affected by the action of the sun. No wonder our civil service is spending so much money on the purchase of gum. Compiling instructions of this sort. NEW YORK'S NUMBER. We're the auto-scratching by the way, as the feature. Expect to see us with the new issue. 4,700,000 N. Y. Father Knickerbocker seen As the chauffeur may be seen Smell that streak of green! 4,700,000 N. Y. Poor Chicago is not near. Hopelily any of the rear. 4,700,000 N. Y. On we travel fast and free. London just ahead we see. Let'er out a notch, I beg! 4,700,000 N. Y. MCLAREN