The Sun.

MONDAY, JULY 31, 1911.

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 daily, including Sunday, 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, 6 Rue de la Michodière, off Rue du Quatre Septembre (near Place de l'Opéra). The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel; Kiosque 77, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opéra, and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Italiens, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

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

The Investigators.

If any plan or method of earning a living and setting aside a competency for old age is not at present under investigation by a special or standing committee of the House of Representatives, its practitioners must be of a most secretive habit or else preeminently unsuccessful. As there is alleged to be a strong popular prejudice against all men who are not worried about the source of to-morrow's dinner, the enthusiasm of the House for stalking the offensively prosperous is easily to be understood. Thrift is an offence against public policy, enterprise is under condemnation, and superior ability in everything except speechmaking is open confession of sin.

The statesmen at Washington, themselves not uncomfortably provided for, and without any particular feeling of anxiety, cater to the temper of the discontented and strive to add to their number. "It is a fine day; let's go out and try to injure somebody's business": this appears adequately to describe their attitude. They find justification for their conduct in every pocket that is not bare, and applause for their efforts from every pair of lungs whose owner is not anxious to work. When they find a man who has laid by something they shriek that a crime has been uncovered. When a number of vile creatures are shown to have combined to give value to some hitherto worthless thing a conspiracy has been unearthed. If the man who made two blades of grass grow where one had grown before were alive to-day he would stand trembling in the shadow of the jail.

Thus the full resumption of business activity, the building of new mills, the opening of more workshops, the employment of laborers in greater number, the starting of new savings bank accounts, are encouraged and fostered by the farsighted lawmakers at Washington. In this way they strive to earn the gratitude of a nation they must believe to be mad.

A Day of a "Business Governor."

As an example of what a "business" Governor actually at work can accomplish within a brief time, the record of the Hon. JOHN A. DIX on Friday deserves praise and should command public gratitude. On that day the Governor of this State took final action on forty-four bills. Of these he signed six and vetoed thirty-eight.

The saving to the taxpayers resulting from the Governor's use of his veto power was upward of half a million dollars. But even the saving in money is hardly more to be commended than the suppression of a considerable number of mischievous or merely futile legislative proposals, which served no useful purpose, or, worse, served a purpose disadvantageous to the citizens of the State.

Nor was Friday an unusual day. On Thursday the total of Executive vetoes was fourteen and the approximate benefit to the State Treasury $400,000. Thus in two days the Governor has reduced by nearly a million dollars the size of the State budget for 1912.

We do not know whether any computation has yet been made of the total number of vetoes to the credit of the Hon. JOHN A. DIX. It is to be hoped that such an attractive exercise in addition will presently be made. But enough statistics and a sufficient number of statements have come from Albany already to establish the fact that this State has again elected a Governor who finds not too commonplace the ordinary and necessary tasks of the Executive department.

Had Governor DIX's failures been far more conspicuous and considerable than his first six months of service revealed, it is hardly too much to say that a few days of work such as he put in on Friday would wipe them off the slate or leave them forgotten in the face of overbalancing successes.

Mr. Myers's Explanation.

The Hon. HENRY L. MYERS of Hamilton, Mon., recently elected to the Senate of the United States, on June 21 voted against the Gore resolution directing the Senate Committee on Finance to report the House wool bill not later than July 10. Mr. MYERS was the only Democrat in the Senate voting in the negative, and his act called forth not a little adverse criticism. On July 26 Senator MYERS explained his vote of June 21 and gave his reason for acting with his party associates when the wool revision measure was up for passage.

He was recorded against the Gore resolution because he had promised the men of his State interested in the sheep business to oppose the taking up for revision of the raw wool items at the present special session. He felt that their request for time in which to prepare their case for Congress was reasonable and proper. Yet Senator MYERS confessed that he may have been in error, and he said:

> "However, if in the opinion of this body I erred in my judgment, I assume that I am not the only man who ever erred in judgment. Doubtless there are living abler men than I who have erred in judgment. Doubtless ABRAHAM LINCOLN, GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN, General GRANT, General LEE, STONEWALL JACKSON, NAPOLEON BONAPARTE at times erred in judgment."

Having extracted a little comfort from the thought that if his judgment was at fault he at least was in respectable society, Senator MYERS declared that in any circumstances he would keep his promises regardless of the effect his conduct may have on his political life. With that he was content, and if his explanation of his vote is circulated as widely as were the assaults on him elicited by that vote there seems to be no good reason why the injury they have caused should not be entirely repaired.

What Will Be the Effect of the Agadir Incident?

The apparent improvement in the Moroccan situation reported in the later foreign despatches unmistakably strengthens the hope that the question will be settled without any appeal to arms. The prospect that France and Germany may be able to strike a bargain that will obtain British approval has certainly brightened in the days that have followed the plain talk of the British Prime Minister. Yet underneath the temporary abatement of war talk there lies the permanent problem of maintaining the peace of Europe.

Two years ago all the newspapers and even the more serious and conservative British illustrated and monthly reviews discussed the prospect of a war with Germany with a frankness, with a tone of complete assurance which was astonishing. Apparently at that time it was the settled conviction of a very large fraction of the educated men of England that Germany and Great Britain must soon fight, England for existence, Germany for that expansion which its leaders were daily demanding as its right.

With the death of King EDWARD, the rapid development of an internal crisis and the deliberate effort of the Conservatives to make political capital out of the German "peril," the general discussion died down. The Liberals affected to believe the whole thing had been largely a political invention. There was, indeed, a rather marked reaction, a certain degree of shamefacedness in the British attitude, a rather thinly disguised admission that Great Britain had suffered from an attack of "nerves." On his last visit to England the Kaiser was greeted with a heartiness which a few months before seemed impossible.

But after Agadir, what is to be the resulting public sentiment in Great Britain, granted that Berlin and Paris settle the present dispute amicably? A Liberal Prime Minister and a Radical Chancellor of the Exchequer have recently been compelled to describe the state of British relations with Germany in terms that completely echo the Conservative warnings of two years ago, and a Labor member of Parliament has joined Mr. BALFOUR in pledging national support for imperial defence.

When the present incident has been closed, will there be left in the British mind a conviction that Germany has threatened England with war, with a war that in the British mind represents merely an aggression, an effort to gain a vantage ground to strike British commerce and British naval supremacy, and that, if the danger has been averted and the blows turned aside, a respite rather than any reconciliation has resulted?

At any rate, in England and France alike the Agadir incident has awakened a strong sense of national unity, of national patriotism, lost for the moment in the tangles of internal political disputes. The average Frenchman and Englishman are likely to think more of armies and navies and less of arbitration hereafter. As for the Germans, whatever concessions they ultimately achieve will be attributed to the nation which owns the largest army. If France and England hereafter look to their military resources for protection, the Germans will again be able to defend any increase in their armies by presenting the balance of profit already obtained by this instrument, or by the fear it has inspired in other nations.

Imports of 1911.

If purchases of raw wool and of hides and skins had been as heavy in the fiscal year 1911 as they were in 1910 the imports of the year just closed would have exceeded those of last year by some $40,000,000. As it is the record shows foreign purchases amounting to $1,557,000,000 in 1910 and to $1,528,000,000 in 1911. For some of the fluctuations in import trade there are more or less obvious reasons, while for others none is readily discoverable. Considerable increase in the price of coffee explains the $20,000,000 increase in that account, but what are we to think of the drop of some 30,000,000 pounds and of $21,000,000 in rubber? The decline in raw wool from $51,000,000 last year to $23,000,000 this year may be credited to trade uncertainty caused by tariff agitation, but the fall from $112,000,000 to $70,000,000 in hides and skins cannot be accounted for on that ground.

The industrial activity and the commercial condition of the country are more or less accurately measurable in terms of imports. On that basis the year just closed was well above the average of earlier years. The record shows, as usual, fluctuation in quantity or value of particular articles, but the total indicates on the whole a condition that affords no ground for reasonable complaint. The fact that less champagne and fewer diamonds and silk laces were imported is not at all alarming. Probably because of the high price of coffee more tea and cocoa were bought, but the falling off in coffee does not indicate any serious privation. The United States paid to foreign countries $10,000,000 less for sugar than a year ago, but the domestic supply of the commodity and the imports from those countries and from our insular possessions are ample evidence that sugar was never more freely bought by consumers. In no earlier year have the imports of bananas quite reached $12,000,000; last year they amounted to $14,400,000.

When the Payne bill reduced materially the tariff on lumber much was heard of the inevitable ruin of the American industry through enormous imports from Canada, yet the imports of 1911 were $16,000,000, in comparison with $19,000,000 in 1910, and the quantity imported was less than it was in 1906 and 1907 under the Dingley rates. The reduction in the duty on iron ore from 40 cents to 15 cents a ton has increased imports, but the takings of 1911 amounted to less than $7,000,000, a mere trifle in our total industry. Imports of pig iron in earlier years show wide fluctuations, from $3,000,000 in 1905 to over $15,000,000 in 1907; but the $6,000,000 imports of 1911 can hardly be said to have been appreciably affected by the reduction in duty from $4 to $2.50 a ton. It is very doubtful if the tariff reduction from 67 cents to 45 cents a ton on bituminous coal had anything to do with a $500,000 increase in 1911 imports. An increase in average in price is the principal reason for the increase from $65,000,000 to $72,000,000 in imports of raw silk, and price also accounts for the rise from $31,000,000 to $38,000,000 in bar tin. We bought more raw cotton and wood pulp than in the preceding year, and less wool cloth and dress goods, fewer dressed furs and tin plates. Many of the items on the 1911 list show large gains over the imports of ten years ago, but in comparison with 1910 they show only the usual fluctuation.

On the whole, the imports of the year make an excellent showing.

What Senator Bailey Needs.

By the time this article is printed the Hon. JOSEPH WELDON BAILEY of Texas may have withdrawn his resignation from the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate and explained that he did not mean it. That is Mr. BAILEY's habit, and a very comforting habit it must be to him. The ease and skill with which he writes a resignation are equalled only by the facility with which he composes its retraction. His enthusiasm for resigning and taking back his resignations is surpassed only by the equanimity with which his colleagues accept his retirements.

Senator BAILEY has freely admitted many times that the conduct of his associates displeased him. He is entirely conscious of the fact that none of them approaches him in delicacy of honor, in learning, in statesmanlike accomplishments, in understanding of the party creed. His superiority to all other lawmakers he confesses frequently, and with as much humility as he thinks is desirable. That the performance of his duties as a legislator must often be hampered seriously by the necessity of cooperating with those whom he recognizes as his inferiors is obvious. No proclamation of the fact is necessary from him.

Plainly there should be established a special legislative body for Senator BAILEY's exclusive use. It might be known as the Super-Senate, and only Super-Senators should be eligible to membership. This would exclude everybody except the Hon. JOSEPH WELDON BAILEY, and thus a perfect legislative body, the first the world has ever known, would come into being. And a liberal Government should stock the meeting place of this glorious council with toys in order that Super-Senator BAILEY might have something to take home whenever it seemed well to him to stop playing.

> Circulars allowed to remain on the boulevard sidewalks; dust and garbage lying out all day in the poorer parts of the city; the wood paving in a terrible state of disrepair; eternal excavations surrounded by eternal palisadings at important points of the city.—*From the Tribune.*

No, this is not a description of conditions in New York, or any other American city; it is written of Paris, the capital of beauty and art.

Ex-Governor VARDAMAN is annoyed in his campaign for the United States Senate by Farmer BILL MCCAULLA, who declares that fifteen years ago Mr. VARDAMAN bought from him a cow and never paid for it. A serious charge, it is causing the Vardaman supporters much uneasiness. Farmer BILL takes a mean advantage. A candidate or a deacon should not be held to account for his private transactions in live stock.

The Intervarsity Match.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Before the late Oxford-Cambridge versus Harvard-Yale athletic contest passes out of the list of current topics, let me draw attention to the grudging spirit in which the New York newspapers yielded the victory to those who had fairly won it.

The "grand stand play" was made that virtually it was an American victory, forsooth, because a gentleman from Kansas was on the Oxford-Cambridge team that won by one point.

Rubbish! It was no more an American victory than it was an English victory. Can spurious patriotism void of all true sportsmanship cloud the fact that it was not an international but an intervarsity meeting into which nationality did not enter?

What if a Rhodes scholar from this country did help his varsity to win? Could a sportsman and a gentleman have acted otherwise? He won as an Oxonian, not as an American, because it was purely an intervarsity match. Had it been, on the contrary, an international contest, he would of course have competed under American colors.'

I have had the advantage of discussing this subject with an ex Rhodes scholar, who was so popular and such an excellent athlete that he was elected president of the Oxford University Athletic Club. He warmly insisted on the duty of every Rhodes scholar while at Oxford to uphold the preeminence of his alma mater against any other varsity, no matter to what country he belonged, which under the circumstances was outside of consideration.

The opinion of a gentleman so competent to form it admits of no contradiction. It was solely an intervarsity meeting, won by the best team, so let all unworthy cavillings cease.

HIGHWOOD, N. J., July 29. EX OXONIAN.

Whence "Baltusrol."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In answer to the inquiry of John Worthy as to how the name "Baltusrol" came to be used, allow me to say that a man by that name lived in that section for years, until one morning he was found murdered. The mystery has remained unsolved to this day. The place has been called after him ever since.

NEW YORK, July 29. B. W.

Fast Life in Connecticut.

From the Litchfield Enquirer.

Dr. N. L. Deming had a hen coming off Monday. The rush of events is so rapid in Litchfield that it is hard for a live newspaper to keep up with the procession.

PROHIBITION IN THE SOUTH.

DALLAS, Tex., July 26.—Prohibition is carried backward on the crest of a receding wave. It has been beaten outright in Alabama. South Carolina has established the local option alternative, and the counties that want money get it from the dispensary, while the counties that say they don't want it submit to high taxation or go ragged. In Georgia prohibition still exists on paper, but the State is wide open, according to the sentiment of the particular locality, while the authorities get money by the simple process of rounding up the saloons at stated periods and fining them exactly as much as they used to pay for licenses. It is a joke, of course, but in this way the public coffers are recruited and the excellent prohibitionists are satisfied, or at least kept measurably quiet, for the time being. North Carolina, which seems to have abundant resources and to be independent of all whiskey revenue, direct or indirect, is broken out all over with lockers, social clubs and easy going drug stores. It is not difficult to believe that so long as the public revenue holds out the existing status will be maintained in North Carolina. There is plenty to drink wherever a parched gullet craves it, and if the State prefers to maintain the hypocrisy and can afford it, why not?

In respect of strong waters there is little difference anywhere south of the Potomac, the Ohio and the Missouri. The individual can get his fill of red liquor as effectually in one neighborhood as in another, the only difference being one of methods. But all the States are not as rich as North Carolina, and so it happens that here and there the humbug has been frankly repudiated and the public revenue referred to local option. This has happened in South Carolina and Alabama, and in the latter State just in time, for the Government there had begun to double taxes on landed property, while the blind tiger and the bootlegger were reaping harvests under prohibition's nose. As regards Georgia, it has been already explained that the Government derives a comfortable revenue while keeping a perfectly straight face, and of Tennessee it is enough to say that one buys all the whiskey he wants in Nashville without resorting to the smallest subterfuge. Jacksonville, Fla., is one of the largest distributing centres in the whole country, and Richmond, Va., is a close second in the joyous trade. Prohibition, in fact, can point only to an academic triumph in the South; the police courts are as full of "drunks" as ever, and the one fact worth recording is that State and county treasuries are the sole victims of the pious fraud.

Now comes Texas, where after a contest of almost indescribable bitterness the wets have won by a comparatively narrow majority. The prohibitionists made the mistake of treating Texas as if it were a small, compact and homogeneeous commonwealth, whereas it is in extent and variety of population, as it soon will be in respect of numbers and industrial substance, a veritable empire. They expected to find it of one way of thinking, and to overcome such scattered resistance as might be encountered by the force of music and prayers and free lunches. Notwithstanding their organization and the influences they brought to bear through denominational solidarity, they have made a failure. It is perfectly evident that in Texas there are wide divergences of opinion. Through the exercise of a very little common sense and discretion, in other words by appealing to local option, they might have brought about the only compromise that intelligent persons have any right to expect, that is to say, liquor dealing where the people want it, and prohibition, with all its evasions and hypocrisies, where a majority demands. There are rumors of a contest, in favor of the prohibitionists, of course, for the champions of morality invariably charge corruption when they are defeated. But it is hardly probable that these contests will accomplish anything serious. It is apparent that Texas is not ready to submit to statewide prohibition, and the verdict of last week's polls will stand.

Altogether prohibition is not nearly so strong in the South to-day as it was five years ago. The people are getting weary of its failures and their attendant demoralization. They have seen that it really prohibits nothing, that the police courts and calabooses are as full as ever, and that the only practical difference is to be found in depleted treasuries and a visible increase of degradation.

THE REAL LANGUAGE.

Thoughts Inspired by the "Niceness" of Supersensitive Critics.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* "A Hot Weather Philologer" wants some one to tell him "why the place in Massachusetts now known as Woods Hole was formerly called Wood's Holl." Let him consider that before Wood's Holl was, there was Wood's Hole; also Holmes's Hole, nearly opposite, on Martha's Vineyard.

But some thirty or forty years ago, to a certain hypersensitive, newly settled dweller at Wood's Hole it became offensive to live in a "Hole"; no objection ever made by mariners to "run for it" in a breeze; or for that other "Hole" across the Sound. And the sensitive one agitated, and agitated, and wrote letters to the newspapers about it, learned to a degree, contending that "Holl" was nicer; and didn't the Vikings land there anyway before we had been good and plenty discovered; and "Holl" in Viking talk meant hill, and there were a few hills around Falmouth way; so that "Holl" must have been meant; and so there we all are.

Similarly certain mealy mouthed people speak of "Hurl Gate," near New York, when they mean "Hell Gate," so corrupted from the Dutch "Helle Gat," which in the vernacular means "the bright strait", named thus by the early explorers for reasons easily surmised. This word "hell" in the Teutonic tongues is a most ordinary and common one, meaning light or bright.

Said a little girl, whose aunt, a German lady married to an American, brought up her children, the little girl's cousins, with knowledge of German, this over forty years ago, "Aunt S., F. uses such funny language. She said she had a dress that was 'hell blue.'"

The little cousin only meant what the first explorers of the East River meant when they named its entrance into the Sound De Helle Gat, or Hell Gate.

TWO WALL STREET.

NEW YORK, July 29.

Another Baconian Theory.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your correspondent F. A. Smith ingeniously works "Tobaco" into Bacon. For those who have any doubts that Shakespeare wrote his plays, I personally having none, I offer the following solution, which after a careful study leaves "no possible doubt whatever" that Bacon wrote "Hamlet"!

Take "Hamlet," substitute Bacon for Ham and we have Baconlet, which means small Bacon. Bacon was small.

Again, take Hamlet's irony to Polonius about "weak hams"; weak hams make strong bacon. What further damning "proof" do we want that Bacon did not write Shakespeare?

Bacon was a vain man and he would not so caricature himself. Have at thee now, Baconians!

CHARLES OSAM LANDER.

SWAMPSCOTT, Mass., July 29.

Signs of Genius.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The following signs interested me greatly on a trip through the West. At Warren, Ohio, "Wm. Fatwell, Groceries"; another, "Spouting," not the William Jennings Bryan variety, but tin ones.

PHILADELPHIA, July 29. WALTER B. SWAN.

VALUABLES LOST ON TRAIN.

Railroad Held Responsible Under State of Facts Shown.

A decision of interest to travellers has been handed down by the Court of Appeals of New York in the suit of Julia M. Hasbrouck against the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, in which the court holds the railroad company liable for damages for the loss of valuables taken from a suit case while it was standing unguarded at the end of a car. The decision affirms judgments of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court in the Third Department and the trial court in a suit for $1,500.

The plaintiff left New York city on May 23, 1908, for Natick, Mass., where she intended to attend a reception at a school attended by her daughter. She packed a necessary wardrobe in a suit case, and in the bottom beneath her clothing she put a card case containing four rings and $25 in currency, which was in three bills wrapped around the rings. The suit case was not locked on the journey because the lock was out of order, but it was fastened with a catch on either side of the lock. She preferred to carry the suit case rather than to check it because she wanted to avoid having it scratched in eing handled. Although she opened the suit case in the Grand Central Station with a few other women near by and took out the card case to get money to pay her fare, no one was near when she did it.

The plaintiff kept the suit case by her side until the train neared Worcester, where she had to change cars, and then she asked the conductor to send some one to take the suit case off the train. Soon afterward a trainman came and asked her if she was the lady who had sent for some one to take the suit case off the train, and in response to her query as to whether the train had reached Worcester the trainman said yes and told her he would take her suit case if she was through with it. The plaintiff believed that the train was about to stop and permitted the trainman to take the suit case and saw him carry it to the rear of the car. The train did not reach Worcester for about fifteen minutes, and although the trainman stood at the foot of the steps he did not help the plaintiff off, but said, "Here's your grip." Soon after boarding the other train the plaintiff examined the suit case and found the clothing disturbed, and then discovered that the card case was soiled about the edges. She found the least valuable of the four rings remaining, but the three others and the money were gone.

Judge Vann, writing the opinion, remarks that the plaintiff "was a lady of prominence, the rings were adapted to her social position and she was in the habit of wearing them to parties and receptions." While she had some money in a handbag, she took the bills in the card case for "extra money," if the occasion required. Her railroad ticket was issued by the New York, New Haven and Hartford, and on it was a notice which stated that in selling the ticket for passage over other roads the company acted only as agent and assumed no responsibility beyond its own line. The company also assumed no risk on baggage except for wearing apparel and limited its responsibility to $100, all baggage exceeding that value to be taken at the owner's risk unless by special contract.

Certain rules of the defendant railroad company, as lessee of the Boston and Albany, upon which the loss occurred, concerning the conduct of its employees were read in evidence in behalf of the plaintiff. The one governing conductors provided:

> Passenger conductors will be responsible for the movement, safety and care of the train and for the vigilance and conduct of the men employed thereon, and must report any misconduct or neglect of duty. The reputation of a railroad depends greatly upon the attention and courtesy shown its passengers. See that trainmen assist passengers on and off trains. Passenger trainmen report to and receive their instructions from the trainmaster, and while on trains are subject to the order of the conductor. Take position at the car steps to assist passengers on and off the trains and inform passengers getting on the train as to its destination and where it is scheduled to stop. The proper place for the rear trainman when the train is in motion is on the rear car. Other trainmen will pass through the train at intervals to look after the comfort of the passengers and for the safety of the train.

A passenger train man who was employed on the road in question during the period when the plaintiff lost her valuables testified that it was the custom of the trainmen to observe these rules and that he habitually assisted passengers in getting their baggage off the train. The plaintiff said that she did not read her ticket and observe that the company's responsibility was limited to $100 and didn't notice the printing in question because it was so small.

At the close of the plaintiff's case the defendant moved for a non-suit on the ground that the defendant did not undertake to care for the valuables in the suit case, that it was not paid therefor, and that the fact that they were carried in a suit case negatives the idea that they were carried for the comfort, appearance and adornment of the plaintiff. The trial Judge found that the defendant's trainman in assisting the plaintiff off the train with her baggage was discharging a duty of the defendant to the plaintiff and was not the plaintiff's servant. The court also found that the plaintiff delivered her property to the defendant, its servant and trainman, and notwithstanding the duty of the defendant to deliver the suit case and contents to the plaintiff when she alighted from the train it failed to deliver the rings and money. The court found that the defendant negligently cared for the suit case and its contents and that the property was lost without any negligence on the part of the plaintiff.

Judge Vann writes that the evidence warranted the conclusion of the trial court that the trainman was acting within the line of his duty when he took the suit case to assist the plaintiff off the train, because the rules and custom of the road sustain such finding. Moreover, the trainman was subject to the orders of the conductor, and acted under his direction. While the trainman might refuse to carry off hand baggage if there were many such applications or he was otherwise engaged, he did not refuse, but took possession of the plaintiff's suit case. The court says further:

> In furnishing the assistance which he assumed to afford to the passenger he was obliged only to discharge that duty so as not to conflict with a similar obligation to other passengers, and if for that reason he could not have given the suit case undivided attention and it had been rifled without any negligence on his part the defendant would not have been liable, but in this case there is no explanation afforded of how the loss occurred. There is nothing to show what care the trainman bestowed upon the suit case, and in the absence of any proof on the subject the trial court or the jury would have been allowed to infer that it had been occasioned by negligence.

Judge Vann said that while it was not shown that it was the custom of trainmen to keep the baggage in their custody for so long a time the plaintiff was not responsible for the length of time that elapsed, since when she gave the trainman her baggage she believed the train had reached Worcester. She had a right to believe so because of the trainman's reply to her question. The law did not require the plaintiff to seek out the trainman because the train did not stop in a few minutes and take back her baggage, "for the law is satisfied if her action was reasonable under the circumstances, and that was a question of fact."

The court said that the plaintiff's property was lawfully in the possession of the defendant, and its possession was not that of a carrier because the suit case had not been checked as baggage nor entrusted to it for the journey, but only for the special purpose of aiding a woman passenger in getting off a train, in accordance with a custom established by itself. Hence the railroad was not liable as an insurer, but "its possession was that of a bailee, and the law of bailments measures its obligation to the plaintiff in regard to her property."

On this subject the court said:

> Whether it was a bailee for hire in performing a service incidental to her carriage as a passenger with the obligation of ordinary care or a gratuitous bailee with the obligation of slight care, the result is the same. In either event some care was required, and none was shown. The law required the defendant to return all the property intact or explain its loss in some satisfactory way, but it did neither. It did not deliver the rings or money in the implied demand of the plaintiff as she got off the train, and when confronted by proof of the facts in court it called no witness and gave no explanation. If the rings were stolen from its trainman it should have proved the fact, and if the trainman himself stole them, it would have been no defence, because the railroad was bound to employ faithful servants. The obligation to deliver or make an explanation sufficient in law rested on the defendant under all the circumstances, and it did not discharge the obligation.

As to a suggestion that the plaintiff was guilty of contributory negligence in delivering her suit case when it was neither locked nor fastened except by the catches, the court says that contributory negligence in the ordinary sense has no application to a bailment made under the circumstances of this case, because the plaintiff proved delivery to the defendant and failure to redeliver on her demand. If the company had proved that the articles were stolen while the trainman was attending to other duties or that they could not have been stolen had the suit case been locked a different question would have been presented. It was said that the trainman was in court during the trial, but the defendant neither called him nor gave any excuse for not doing so. The presumption from the evidence is that the defendant still has the articles in its possession or that it has converted them to its own use, and while the presumption would have been rebutted by a proper explanation none was given.

In defining the articles stolen as part of necessary baggage the court said:

> The plaintiff took the articles in question with her for personal use at a reception to be held at the end of her journey and a small amount of money to be used in case of emergency. The jewelry was adapted to her tastes, habits and standing, as the court found upon sufficient evidence, and the amount of money was found to be no greater than was reasonable and prudent. Under the facts as thus settled we think the suit case and contents were baggage such as is frequently called luggage and that in the absence of any limitation by statute, regulation of the road or inquiry as to value the defendant is liable for the reasonable value of what was lost. The contract to transport the plaintiff carried with it the duty of transporting a reasonable amount of hand baggage, such as is commonly taken by travellers for their personal use, the quantity and value depending upon station in life, object of the journey and other considerations.

The court in conclusion appreciates the danger that fraud may be practised upon railroad companies by unscrupulous passengers and says that clear proof and conservative action by the courts is necessary, but the present action stands by itself, because the credibility of the plaintiff was conceded.

VOTES FOR HOUSEKEEPERS.

Domestic Scientists Will Be Common When Women Have the Ballot.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Flora Hazard in a recent letter in THE SUN says in substance that women ought not to be given a vote, but ought to be taught housekeeping. They are more apt to be taught housekeeping where they have a vote. One of the first things that the women of Norway did with their ballots was to get the Government to start schools of domestic training for girls.

Mrs. Helen Loring Grenfell, who served three terms as State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Colorado, mentions this among the good results of equal suffrage. She says: "Instead of thinking less of their homes, women began to consider them more carefully and sought to bring into these close corporations something of the scientific spirit of the age. Chairs of domestic economy were established in the State Agricultural College and the State Normal School. The interest in the old fashioned womanly arts has increased instead of diminished."

In Idaho woman suffrage has led to the addition of a department of domestic science to the State university.

Baroness Aletta Korff, formerly an American girl, a Bryn Mawr graduate, the daughter of Surgeon-General Van Reypen, now the wife of an official in Finland, says in an article in the *National Geographic Magazine*, describing the results of woman suffrage in Finland:

"One of the noteworthy reforms undertaken by the women has been the establishment of schools of domestic training throughout the country—schools intended to teach girls to become efficient and capable wives and mothers. These schools are of great importance, especially in the country districts and among the poorer class of people. They are becoming most valuable factors in the cultural development of the country, and are doing more than could perhaps be done in any other way to raise the general standard of living."

Lady Stout, wife of the Chief Justice of New Zealand, says that since women got the ballot a society with branches in every district has been organized "to train women and girls in intelligent motherhood and home making." Lady Stout adds that this is "the outcome of the new feeling of responsibility in women, awakened by their rights of citizenship."

The National Bureau of Education asked our last Congress for an additional appropriation of $75,000 to enable it to meet constantly growing demands and opportunities for service. It got $7,600—about one-tenth of what it asked. Among the items requested was money to investigate the best methods of industrial education—which is chiefly for boys—and of education for housekeeping. Congress granted the first and refused the second. Congress would not have been nearly so likely to strike out the appropriation for education in housekeeping if the women of the United States were voters.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

CHILMARK, Mass., July 29.

ARMY AND NAVY MEN.

An Explanation of Certain Prejudices Against Their Uniforms.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* There is not a better class of men in the whole world to be found anywhere than in the United States army and navy. With so many thousands of men it is of course, or at least almost, impossible to have every one a model. Wherever there are a great many men together there also the bad will occasionally get in.

There are certain people in our country who are always glad to hear of an incident in which our soldiers or sailors have the misfortune to get into trouble. If note were taken of the incidents it would be seen that it is nearly always the soldiers or sailors who have tried to avert a fight, instead of trying to first get into a fight, as some persons like to say.

You say well when you say that it is generally the places of the lowest kind that exclude the uniform. Their proprietors know well that the man in the uniform is far superior to themselves.

Men that look down on the uniform are jealous of the other's superior qualities. Surely the men who are willing to go through anything to save our beloved country are worthy of the highest respect we can give them.

HENRY C. SAWYER.

ASTORIA, L. I., July 29.

An Alsatian Tree of Liberty.

From the London Globe.

The tree of liberty at Wissembourg, in Alsace has been condemned. It was planted in 1792, conformably to a decree of the National Convention, to commemorate the abolition of the monarchy and the proclamation of the French Republic. Of course at that time Alsace formed a part of France, and the tree was planted amid general rejoicing. The oak "waxed and grew strong," and is now vanquished by nature's laws. Having reached its full strength the decline gradually set in. First the branches showed signs of weakness, and then the roots withered, so as a precautionary measure the tree which has stood for a hundred and nineteen years is to disappear.

Qualifications for Voting.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* After reading the article "New Way to Stop Negro Votes" in this morning's SUN I am moved to write and suggest that it would be a good way to settle the "Woman Suffrage" question as well, and the franchise might be as reasonably extended to each woman who can produce the certificate of two chaste men that they would trust her in the dark.

A WHITE WOMAN.

WEST BRIGHTON, S. I., July 29.

RELICS OF ANCIENT MAN.

Attempt to Fix Their Age in Years Belittles Investigation.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I should not have entered the lists in this very simple question of the antiquity of man in North America were there not so much misapprehension upon the part of those acquainted with it only through reading. Those who have borne the heat and burden of the day in exploration know where they stand, and others do not.

It is not a theoretical question; if so, it were soon settled, for the American Indian theoretically has been long enough on the continent to become a distinct species of man and not merely a geographical "race" of a type of man elsewhere, as we find species of birds and mammals. There is left but one resource, to examine patiently, persistently and without bias the various superficial deposits of sand, gravel and vegetation sustaining soils, and determine the relation to them of such traces of man as we find there. Such investigation is not the diversion of a summer holiday, as some geologists have made it, but to be of value must be the constant occupation of years. As one swallow does not make the summer, so one object does not lay open the past that he who runs may read. With proper modesty I present myself as one who has given many years to this subject, has not visited many localities, but lived in one; and it is by the accumulation of evidence derived from such a source that I have felt authorized first to express an opinion, in 1876, and later to make an ex cathedra statement.

That such statement should invite criticism is natural, and it is eminently desirable. It moved me to be thorough in some directions that seemed of minor importance when in the field, and the result to date is that every objection raised has been met with an unanswerable fact.

Grudgingly admitting that man might have witnessed the closing incidents of the glacial period, and I am positive that this is true, whence came these later spectators to the drama of ice and snow? Surely they must have had ancestors, and if they were living south of glacial activities, why not for a time that reaches back to the beginning of such conditions, and therefore living where later the ice made the land uninhabitable? Certainly we have no positive knowledge of the peopling of the continent, but if the point first reached was in South America, which is a very plausible view, why should not the advance northward have been in late tertiary time, unless geologists can show the country then was not in such condition that human life was possible? But geologists have done nothing of the sort, and if man can now live in tiger infested and fever stricken India and low types of humanity can hold their own in Africa in spite of the lion, rhinoceros and elephant, he could certainly have flourished here with cave bears, sabre toothed tigers and the mammoth. All the indications are that he did. The modernity of man in America is but a lingering on of the fable of the recent and single origin of all mankind, most strangely fostered by attachés of museums, who love to theorize but hate the sight of a pick or shovel.

As to the special reports of the geology of the Delaware Valley to which a correspondent refers in THE SUN of July 27, it can be safely said they do not correctly set forth the actual conditions, as the subject was prejudged by Professor Saulsbury, and no man can see actuality, having predetermined what he is to see on visiting the spot. It is an impossibility in all other lines of investigation, so why not in this, when a man to do effective work must be absolutely free mentally? Prepossessions of any kind are fatal. I made known to the scientific world that traces of man were found in the valley of the Delaware before I ever heard of paleolithic and neolithic man in Europe. My supposition was that what I found simply indicated that the Indian as known to the European settlers of other centuries had ancestry that was ruder in culture than those of the sixteenth century.

Much stress is laid upon the precise age of a particular layer of sand or gravel; more, indeed, than the question calls for, as the character of the human traces found means much more, and here let those who are interested take notice: not a trace of human handiwork has been discovered, of the many thousands gathered by either Mr. Volk or myself, that contradicts the sequence of events as first I and then he laid it down, of "gravel" implements, upper sand deposits, and the vegetation sustaining soil.

Of the gravel objects it may be said that they are associated with bones of mammals now living and also bones of mammals extinct, as elephant and mastodon, and of Arctic animals, as walrus, muskox, reindeer and polar bear. Of the overlying sands it may be said that they are practically all of one material and rude in comparison to the flint work of the Indian, and not associated with pottery. On the surface or plough deep is everywhere the trace of the historic Indian.

This sequence shows a long lapse of time, and one that I think it is useless to try to estimate in numbers of years. This is idle guessing and belittles the subject.

The so-called Trenton gravel is a glacial deposit in the sense of being deposited by floods derived from the melting glaciers. The human implements found in them were lost here, not carried any distance; and the reason for their occurrence is plain enough, for it was here that the floods met the tide. The current was checked, and all about extended a wide area of high and dry habitable land sustaining a fauna attractive to man.

The river's story is very simple, and there never would have been all this pother of how correctly I told it three decades ago had it not been that geologists would not see for themselves, or assumed that it was a question wholly within their province and not in mine as an amateur archæologist. Hinc illæ lachrymæ.

CHARLES CONRAD ABBOTT.

TRENTON, N. J., July 29.

THE TIP DISEASE.

The Weekly Protest Against the Daily Evil.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Isn't it time to enter another protest against the enslavement of the American people to the tip disease? Last evening it was forced upon my attention in a peculiar way. I had lunched at an inexpensive restaurant, alone. My tip amounted to one-half the cost of my lunch. Each one who sat at the table gave at least 25 per cent. of the amount that the food came to. We felt obliged to "cough it up." The waiter hovered about like a vulture, and we knew that his surliness must be pacified, and as "thoughts are things" none of us wished to be damned on our way out.

But I refer to a later experience. Wishing to hear some bright music and push dull care aside I determined to go to a certain show. After the first act I discovered an usher who had come down the aisle with some drinking water. Having partaken of the beverage that nature wills I returned the glass. After the next act I disentangled myself from the fascinations of the play to observe that each drinker was clinking his nickel or dime in payment for the small glass of water that any rightly conducted theatre is supposed to contribute for the comfort of its patrons who have paid liberally for their seats.

Now it happened that a lady sitting next to me was very thirsty and wanted some water. She and her escort did their best to attract the attention of the water boy, and so did I, but because I hadn't given him a tip he would not look our way at all, though we three were concentrating our attention upon him and he could not fail to know it.

One finds the shaving at a barber shop rather too expensive. The price of a shave usually being 15 cents, every man knows that the attendant expects a tip. Five cents they consider an insult, and 10 cents brings the shave to 25 cents. That is more than most men can afford; the consequence is that men are using their own razors more and more.

I spent over fifteen years serving the public as faithfully and conscientiously as any of these, in work that called for personal attention, but was never in all that time given a tip, nor did I expect it.

A READER.

NEW YORK, July 29.

Conjugation.

Swim, swam, swimming, engaged.