

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS. The Associated Press is not responsible for the publication of all news appearing in this paper and also for the local news published herein. All rights of publication of special dispatches herein are reserved.

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

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid. One Year \$10.00. Six Months \$6.00. Three Months \$3.50. Daily only \$1.00. Sunday only \$0.50.

ADVERTISING RATES. Daily \$1.00 per line. Sunday \$0.50 per line. Long copy \$1.50 per line. Foreign \$2.00 per line.

THE EVENING SUN. \$10.00 per year. \$6.00 per six months. \$3.50 per three months. Daily only \$1.00. Sunday only \$0.50.

BOOKS AND THE BOOK WORLD. The Sun Printing and Publishing Association, 100 Nassau St., New York, N. Y.

Published daily, including Sunday, by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association, 100 Nassau St., New York, N. Y.

London office, 40 Abchurch Lane, E.C. 4. Telephone, 303. Telegrams, "Sun" and "Sunprint."

Telephone, BEEKMAN 2200.

Why Germany Gave Up.

The revelations of the German White Book, from the first copy of which to reach this country, THE SUN publishes to-day in another section of this newspaper the most significant and important parts, showing that the real attitude of the German Government to the power wielded by the United States in the war was widely at variance with the public utterances of many German officials and military commanders.

The fact that America was able to transport each month to the western front a force almost twice as large as Germany could at the same time put into the field and that this American force was soon to grow into an army of more than 2,000,000 became finally the determining factor at the two memorable conferences held in Berlin on October 17 and early in November of 1918, when the decision was made for the acceptance of President Wilson's terms for the cessation of hostilities.

The conference at Berlin in October was between the civil authorities and the German General Staff as represented by General Ludendorff, General Hoffmann and Colonel Herz. The Imperial Chancellor, referring to a new note which contained increased demands and which must be definitely answered, said:

"Wilson is plainly driven by the American chauvinists and the pressure of France and England into a difficult position, and I hope, as he himself hopes, that we may give him the opportunity to treat with us further and thus to withstand those who seek to prosecute the war still further."

Declaring that before he would reply to the note he must have a clear understanding of the military position before the military officers present a series of questions. To his inquiry as to how many Americans were reaching France each month the answers were as follows:

"Colonel Herz:—The average of last month was 250,000. General Ludendorff:—In April, May and June the average was 350,000.

"The Chancellor:—How great will be the strength of the American Army by next spring?" "Colonel Herz:—The American command figures for the present strength at 1,200,000. For next spring they estimate 2,300,000."

The significance of this lay in the fact that has just been disclosed that Germany could not furnish more than 100,000 men a month, many of whom were not fit for service, and if the nation was to supply the 600,000 men demanded by General Ludendorff for a supreme effort on the western front it would be unable to furnish the normal monthly quota. It was also shown that troops could not be transferred from the eastern front to the western because of the danger of the encroachment of Bolshevism and the demoralizing effect the troops from Russia would have upon the better disciplined troops on the French front. Another fear that haunted Germany was expressed by Secretary of State SCHEIDEMANN:

"The very length of the war has tired the people—and then the blockade, food troubles and the falling away of our allies. The workmen are saying: 'Rather an end with terrors than terrors without end.'"

At the conference of the Secretaries on November 5 General GABRINA made the address which practically decided the action of the German Government. In this he showed that the Germans had on the western front only fifty-eight divisions in reserve, while their opponents had ninety-six, and furthermore, that the average strength of the "French battalion was 600, of the English about 700, the American 1,200, while with us it has declined as low as 500." With such a lack of reserves he declared it was not only difficult but practically impossible to "hold our present position permanently."

"The White Book thus gives the outside world the first satisfactory statement of the actual conditions in Germany preceding the armistice and it clears away many of the false impressions regarding the powers and the influences that brought about the overthrow of the Hohenzollern régime. It shows that the vaunted strength of the German army had been tested to its utmost, that the Kaiser's military forces had been overcome and that the Allies and the United States had won a military victory in the war.

side world the first satisfactory statement of the actual conditions in Germany preceding the armistice and it clears away many of the false impressions regarding the powers and the influences that brought about the overthrow of the Hohenzollern régime. It shows that the vaunted strength of the German army had been tested to its utmost, that the Kaiser's military forces had been overcome and that the Allies and the United States had won a military victory in the war.

Ticker Tapes for the Food Shops?

With a fresh list issued every day of the "fair" prices for meat and groceries the business of shopping becomes more interesting even if it is more complicated.

Eventually shall we not see the various controllers of food prices install in retail stores throughout the city modern quotation machinery such as is employed in the larger but no more important stock market?

Let there be comfortable chairs, such as brokers' offices have, for the housewife, and a ticker tape bringing in the very latest quotations. "Chuck roast of an eighth! Pork chops 47 1/2! Canned tomatoes No. 2, 12 1/2! Eggs 59! Lima beans 13 1/2!" The ladies in haste to go to the market might be tempted to wait a while for a drop in commodities.

America's Standard of Living.

What is the "American standard of living"? This veteran question is put on parade in the July issue of the Labor Review, published by the United States Department of Labor, by ROYAL MEKKEK, Commissioner of Labor Statistics. He admits at the outset that it is a difficult problem, and particularly so in these times of abnormal prices; but he goes to it resolutely, basing his findings on the investigations of 800 department agents who looked into the receipts and expenditures of 13,000 families in seventy-one large and twenty-six small towns.

One of the first of Mr. MEKKEK's conclusions is that, contrary to a rather common belief, the American family does not suffer from over-feeding.

"We can say with confidence that it requires to-day an expenditure of from 50 to 60 cents per man per day for food to secure a well balanced diet sufficient in the number of calories and in variety. This means that American families consisting of husband, wife and three children below the age of 15 years, living in large and medium sized cities, must spend about \$610 per annum for food to keep themselves properly nourished for health and efficiency. This expenditure for food goes with incomes of from \$1,800 to \$1,850, so we may say that American families on the average are not fully nourished until their yearly income reaches \$1,850. These figures do not indicate that our people are to-day suffering from eating too much meat, or even too much of other foods not so expensive. The average income and the median income both fall well below \$1,600. The mode is about \$1,350 and the average not greatly higher. Conclusions must not be too hastily drawn from our figures. They do not mean that our working population is dying of slow starvation; nothing of the sort. But they do indicate that the workers of America are obliged to live on a diet too restricted and monotonous for the maintenance of as high a degree of efficiency and health as ought to be maintained as a reasonable minimum. I am of the opinion that the most efficacious remedy is not higher wages, but rather improved systems for distributing and marketing food-stuffs and the education of housekeepers in the art of keeping house, with emphasis on diets. Housekeeping is not exactly a lost art. It is one of the arts that has not yet been completely found."

This dictum that a family of five cannot live on less than \$50 worth of food each month may arouse protests from some domestic wizards who claim to keep physical and mental energy at high peak on a diet of peanuts, lettuce leaves and happy thoughts; but most of our readers will incline to award a medal to the housewife whose grocery and meat bills are kept down to \$1.67 a day when there are five in family.

In the matter of clothing, says Mr. MEKKEK, the American workman as a rule is not extravagant. For his own raiment he spends from \$30 to \$180 a year, according to his income. A married man who makes \$112 a month does not spend more than \$7.50 of it for clothes; and surely \$90 a year is not too much in the varied American climate. It is not enough, says Mr. MEKKEK, that a man should have enough clothing to protect him from heat, cold and precipitation. For "it is repugnant to our sense of right that the working classes should dress in a way to set them apart from the more well to do." Mr. MEKKEK might have added that in these times the workman in certain trades is distinguished from the luckless clerk or lawyer by the fact that he wears a silk shirt at \$8 while the other fellow ticks to cotton.

How about woman's reckless expenditures for adornment? We can hear the cynics ask. By and large, according to Mr. MEKKEK, this is another fiction, for he declares that "wives spend less for clothes than husbands until we reach the higher income, about \$1,800 a year." When economy is necessary it is made largely at the expense of the wife's wardrobe. "The first baby makes a cut in the mother's clothes money

and every addition to the family cuts deeper into this item." The family's outlay for rent varies, of course, according to the locality. The lowest income group questioned in Fall River paid \$105 a year; the highest income group in this city turned \$355 a year over to the landlord. A typical family with an income of \$1,350 a year pays about \$200 rent. The American worker is not so crowded in his living place as the British workman. What it costs to light, heat and furnish the American home is not stated, but Mr. MEKKEK believes that enough fuel is used so that the living room can be lived in during the winter and that the lighting is "probably sufficient."

In the outlay for care of health, insurance, and amusement the divergence is wide, but a general average of the family doctor and medicine bill is \$50 a year, while about \$40 goes for insurance. Families in various conditions of prosperity were questioned as to their contribution to the treasury of the moving picture barons. Families in Philadelphia with an income of \$900 a year spent 38 cents at the movies; those with \$2,500 a year spent \$37.22. The average was \$12.40 a family in Philadelphia and \$9.23 in Boston. This proves, we suppose, the economy of literary culture.

Mr. MEKKEK's conclusion is that the satisfaction of believing that the American standard of living is the highest in the world is not enough. "Let us make the minimum living standard in America," he says, "one that will support life in decency and health." Well, there appear to be nine and forty theoretical ways of attaining this ideal condition, but the Government has not yet found the courage to make a beginning by knocking the artificial prop from beneath living costs by putting wheat on the market at the price it will naturally bring.

What Justice Newburger Means to New York.

Tammany Hall has issued a statement assailing Justice NEWBURGER of the Supreme Court on his official record, thus attempting to square it with the thousands of voters, independents, Democrats and Republicans, whose wrath it aroused by refusing to renominate this satisfactory judicial officer.

and every addition to the family cuts deeper into this item." The family's outlay for rent varies, of course, according to the locality. The lowest income group questioned in Fall River paid \$105 a year; the highest income group in this city turned \$355 a year over to the landlord. A typical family with an income of \$1,350 a year pays about \$200 rent. The American worker is not so crowded in his living place as the British workman. What it costs to light, heat and furnish the American home is not stated, but Mr. MEKKEK believes that enough fuel is used so that the living room can be lived in during the winter and that the lighting is "probably sufficient."

In the outlay for care of health, insurance, and amusement the divergence is wide, but a general average of the family doctor and medicine bill is \$50 a year, while about \$40 goes for insurance. Families in various conditions of prosperity were questioned as to their contribution to the treasury of the moving picture barons. Families in Philadelphia with an income of \$900 a year spent 38 cents at the movies; those with \$2,500 a year spent \$37.22. The average was \$12.40 a family in Philadelphia and \$9.23 in Boston. This proves, we suppose, the economy of literary culture.

Mr. MEKKEK's conclusion is that the satisfaction of believing that the American standard of living is the highest in the world is not enough. "Let us make the minimum living standard in America," he says, "one that will support life in decency and health." Well, there appear to be nine and forty theoretical ways of attaining this ideal condition, but the Government has not yet found the courage to make a beginning by knocking the artificial prop from beneath living costs by putting wheat on the market at the price it will naturally bring.

What Justice Newburger Means to New York. Tammany Hall has issued a statement assailing Justice NEWBURGER of the Supreme Court on his official record, thus attempting to square it with the thousands of voters, independents, Democrats and Republicans, whose wrath it aroused by refusing to renominate this satisfactory judicial officer.

The Tammany assault on Justice NEWBURGER will not convince the public. New York does not go to Tammany Hall for scientific, disinterested analyses of the records of its Judges. Tammany solicitude for the efficiency of Judges is too young and tender a plant to inspire confidence. Tammany statistics of reversals will not be accepted as final. Indeed, in the case of Justice NEWBURGER Tammany statistics will be rejected except in so far as they reveal Tammany fright caused by the storm of popular disapproval created by its attempt to unseat a Judge who merits reelection.

As to Justice NEWBURGER's record on the bench we have the testimony of four bar associations that it is good. We have the testimony of men who have sat long with him as Judges that it is good. This is expert testimony, uncolored by partisanship. It is the testimony of the legal profession, not the testimony of politicians. It is given disinterestedly, not extorted by fear of defeat at the polls. The Tammany attack on Justice NEWBURGER is the vituperative outbreak of scared politicians. The endorsement of Justice NEWBURGER by the legal profession is the deliberate tribute of informed and experienced experts to a worthy Judge.

The issue in Justice NEWBURGER's case far transcends his personal fortunes. It is not merely whether one individual or another shall hold judicial office. It is whether judicial officers shall be at the mercy of Tammany Hall, or shall be responsible only to the people. The decision is more of consequence to the public than it is to Justice NEWBURGER. Were he retired to private life to-day he would survive the change in his occupation. But if Tammany gains control of the bench every citizen will suffer because of the transfer of judicial power from the public court houses to the Tammany Wigwam in Fourteenth street.

"The Rank Is But the Guinea's Stamp."

"He thrust his head from the bedclothes and then seated himself on the bed. His nightgown was of mauve and heavily embroidered. FERDINAND wore gold bracelets on his arm, and rings, with rubies and other precious stones, on every finger."

Thus FERDINAND of Bulgaria, the fallen Fox of the Balkans, received the order to quit his refuge in one of his castles in Austria, issued by CHARLES, himself now a refugee. The Bulgarian czar, so self-styled, cried out for his son to bear witness he was not a traitor. "Kiki," he pleaded, "swear that your father was never a traitor!" Kiki, bemused with sleep, found no ready answer. His father was infuriated. "Kiki," he shouted, "get out! You're only an idiot!" A Bulgarian General in attendance on FERDINAND was called. Count von BERCHTOLD, formerly the Austrian Foreign Minister, repeated the order of expulsion and explained the necessity for immediate flight. FERDINAND, with his son KIKI—formally CYRILLE—and the faithful Bulgarian General, departed in a motor car, carrying with them the money FERDINAND had taken from Bulgaria.

A czar in negligee, with bracelets on his arm, rings on his fingers, frightened by his plight, furlons at his son, makes a grotesque figure not without its appeal to sympathy. But sympathy cannot run far with a feeling monarch who is abandoning his countrymen. NICHOLAS of Russia, from the disjointed accounts of his fall which are at hand, seems to have disclosed a certain manly dignity. But FERDINAND the Fox, his dream of a throne in Constantinople shattered, his arrogance gone, did not cut an inspiring figure. To judge by him the world will say royalty is a poor lot.

But were it to judge by ALANOR of Belgium the decision would be different. Here was a monarch who lived up to the best traditions of royal service. Simple, brave, devoted, persistent, he won the admiration of the world in war and holds it in peace. And GEORGE of England, differently placed, comported himself with dignity, observing the etiquette custom prescribed for Britain's nominal ruler, doing his part for the common good; a fine figure in troubled times.

Two BURNS who said it: I went along accompanied by the late Wilbur J. Chamberlain, also of THE SUN's staff in those days, Mr. Chamberlain and I had been assigned to write the inaugural ceremonies in the United States Senate and the scenes in Washington incident to the inauguration of Lodge.

It will be recalled easily by old time Republicans like Chauncey M. Depew, Francis Hendricks, J. Sloat Fassett, Bernard Biglin, John W. Dwight, George W. Aldridge and others now living that Senator Platt had been very much opposed to the nomination of Mr. McKinley in 1896. His opposition had been almost vicious. It took the form, he appeared on the scenes in St. Louis, of issuing from the Fifth Avenue Hotel vitriolic statements to the New York city newspapers in opposition to Mr. McKinley's nomination. Most of the interesting statements ran along for several months before the convention and were particularly specific in their charge that Mr. McKinley was not sound on the money question. Mr. Platt had been conversant with all the political movements and was strong for the McKinley nomination. Mr. Platt at St. Louis favored either the nomination for President of the late Thomas B. Reed or of Levi P. Morton, former Vice-President and then, 1896, Governor of New York. Mr. Morton is still living in New York City at the late age of 94. But Mark Hanna was too strong for the Platt-Reed-Morton forces. For several years Mr. Hanna, the personal friend and intimate of Mr. McKinley, had been organizing Republican forces in the nation in favor of McKinley's nomination, and Mr. Platt and his friends were easily defeated at St. Louis. It was the McKinley nomination that carried the delegates imbued with the 16 to 1 silver doctrine retired. After the nomination of Mr. McKinley no Republican then alive worked harder or contributed more than Mr. Platt in effort to the election of Mr. McKinley. And Mr. Platt was not without the Republican nomination in that year, 1896, the year in which they had a majority on joint ballot. In the following January, 1897, Mr. Platt in the joint caucus of Assemblymen and Senators received all but a few votes as the candidate of his party for United States Senator. He was elected the following day at the joint session of the Legislature to succeed his old time political adversary David B. Hill. So Mr. Platt was to be inaugurated as a United States Senator on March 4, 1897, the day on which Mr. McKinley was to be inaugurated as President.

General FRESHING has accepted Father Knickerbocker's invitation to be his guest, and Father Knickerbocker is wondering whether he will be allowed to open a bottle of something stronger than spring water in honor of the event.

The fair city of Detroit for a long time had a run of good luck as strong as the current of the river which separates it from Canada. But now, soon after that six cents verdict, comes the news that JACK DEMAREST has selected that city for his home and future battling ground; that CRAYATH is lot footing after Com's batting average, and nothing in which sorrow can be drowned can now be run in across the Ohio line.

Just how far CARTER GLASS's plea for economy, even unto patched trousers, may lead us will probably not be realized until we are well in the political campaign of 1920. Must we look forward to a canvass in which no candidate will amount to shucks unless he can exhibit several bona fide patches?

and every addition to the family cuts deeper into this item." The family's outlay for rent varies, of course, according to the locality. The lowest income group questioned in Fall River paid \$105 a year; the highest income group in this city turned \$355 a year over to the landlord. A typical family with an income of \$1,350 a year pays about \$200 rent. The American worker is not so crowded in his living place as the British workman. What it costs to light, heat and furnish the American home is not stated, but Mr. MEKKEK believes that enough fuel is used so that the living room can be lived in during the winter and that the lighting is "probably sufficient."

In the outlay for care of health, insurance, and amusement the divergence is wide, but a general average of the family doctor and medicine bill is \$50 a year, while about \$40 goes for insurance. Families in various conditions of prosperity were questioned as to their contribution to the treasury of the moving picture barons. Families in Philadelphia with an income of \$900 a year spent 38 cents at the movies; those with \$2,500 a year spent \$37.22. The average was \$12.40 a family in Philadelphia and \$9.23 in Boston. This proves, we suppose, the economy of literary culture.

Mr. MEKKEK's conclusion is that the satisfaction of believing that the American standard of living is the highest in the world is not enough. "Let us make the minimum living standard in America," he says, "one that will support life in decency and health." Well, there appear to be nine and forty theoretical ways of attaining this ideal condition, but the Government has not yet found the courage to make a beginning by knocking the artificial prop from beneath living costs by putting wheat on the market at the price it will naturally bring.

What Justice Newburger Means to New York. Tammany Hall has issued a statement assailing Justice NEWBURGER of the Supreme Court on his official record, thus attempting to square it with the thousands of voters, independents, Democrats and Republicans, whose wrath it aroused by refusing to renominate this satisfactory judicial officer.

The Tammany assault on Justice NEWBURGER will not convince the public. New York does not go to Tammany Hall for scientific, disinterested analyses of the records of its Judges. Tammany solicitude for the efficiency of Judges is too young and tender a plant to inspire confidence. Tammany statistics of reversals will not be accepted as final. Indeed, in the case of Justice NEWBURGER Tammany statistics will be rejected except in so far as they reveal Tammany fright caused by the storm of popular disapproval created by its attempt to unseat a Judge who merits reelection.

As to Justice NEWBURGER's record on the bench we have the testimony of four bar associations that it is good. We have the testimony of men who have sat long with him as Judges that it is good. This is expert testimony, uncolored by partisanship. It is the testimony of the legal profession, not the testimony of politicians. It is given disinterestedly, not extorted by fear of defeat at the polls. The Tammany attack on Justice NEWBURGER is the vituperative outbreak of scared politicians. The endorsement of Justice NEWBURGER by the legal profession is the deliberate tribute of informed and experienced experts to a worthy Judge.

The issue in Justice NEWBURGER's case far transcends his personal fortunes. It is not merely whether one individual or another shall hold judicial office. It is whether judicial officers shall be at the mercy of Tammany Hall, or shall be responsible only to the people. The decision is more of consequence to the public than it is to Justice NEWBURGER. Were he retired to private life to-day he would survive the change in his occupation. But if Tammany gains control of the bench every citizen will suffer because of the transfer of judicial power from the public court houses to the Tammany Wigwam in Fourteenth street.

"The Rank Is But the Guinea's Stamp."

"He thrust his head from the bedclothes and then seated himself on the bed. His nightgown was of mauve and heavily embroidered. FERDINAND wore gold bracelets on his arm, and rings, with rubies and other precious stones, on every finger."

Thus FERDINAND of Bulgaria, the fallen Fox of the Balkans, received the order to quit his refuge in one of his castles in Austria, issued by CHARLES, himself now a refugee. The Bulgarian czar, so self-styled, cried out for his son to bear witness he was not a traitor. "Kiki," he pleaded, "swear that your father was never a traitor!" Kiki, bemused with sleep, found no ready answer. His father was infuriated. "Kiki," he shouted, "get out! You're only an idiot!" A Bulgarian General in attendance on FERDINAND was called. Count von BERCHTOLD, formerly the Austrian Foreign Minister, repeated the order of expulsion and explained the necessity for immediate flight. FERDINAND, with his son KIKI—formally CYRILLE—and the faithful Bulgarian General, departed in a motor car, carrying with them the money FERDINAND had taken from Bulgaria.

A czar in negligee, with bracelets on his arm, rings on his fingers, frightened by his plight, furlons at his son, makes a grotesque figure not without its appeal to sympathy. But sympathy cannot run far with a feeling monarch who is abandoning his countrymen. NICHOLAS of Russia, from the disjointed accounts of his fall which are at hand, seems to have disclosed a certain manly dignity. But FERDINAND the Fox, his dream of a throne in Constantinople shattered, his arrogance gone, did not cut an inspiring figure. To judge by him the world will say royalty is a poor lot.

But were it to judge by ALANOR of Belgium the decision would be different. Here was a monarch who lived up to the best traditions of royal service. Simple, brave, devoted, persistent, he won the admiration of the world in war and holds it in peace. And GEORGE of England, differently placed, comported himself with dignity, observing the etiquette custom prescribed for Britain's nominal ruler, doing his part for the common good; a fine figure in troubled times.

Two BURNS who said it: I went along accompanied by the late Wilbur J. Chamberlain, also of THE SUN's staff in those days, Mr. Chamberlain and I had been assigned to write the inaugural ceremonies in the United States Senate and the scenes in Washington incident to the inauguration of Lodge.

It will be recalled easily by old time Republicans like Chauncey M. Depew, Francis Hendricks, J. Sloat Fassett, Bernard Biglin, John W. Dwight, George W. Aldridge and others now living that Senator Platt had been very much opposed to the nomination of Mr. McKinley in 1896. His opposition had been almost vicious. It took the form, he appeared on the scenes in St. Louis, of issuing from the Fifth Avenue Hotel vitriolic statements to the New York city newspapers in opposition to Mr. McKinley's nomination. Most of the interesting statements ran along for several months before the convention and were particularly specific in their charge that Mr. McKinley was not sound on the money question. Mr. Platt had been conversant with all the political movements and was strong for the McKinley nomination. Mr. Platt at St. Louis favored either the nomination for President of the late Thomas B. Reed or of Levi P. Morton, former Vice-President and then, 1896, Governor of New York. Mr. Morton is still living in New York City at the late age of 94. But Mark Hanna was too strong for the Platt-Reed-Morton forces. For several years Mr. Hanna, the personal friend and intimate of Mr. McKinley, had been organizing Republican forces in the nation in favor of McKinley's nomination, and Mr. Platt and his friends were easily defeated at St. Louis. It was the McKinley nomination that carried the delegates imbued with the 16 to 1 silver doctrine retired. After the nomination of Mr. McKinley no Republican then alive worked harder or contributed more than Mr. Platt in effort to the election of Mr. McKinley. And Mr. Platt was not without the Republican nomination in that year, 1896, the year in which they had a majority on joint ballot. In the following January, 1897, Mr. Platt in the joint caucus of Assemblymen and Senators received all but a few votes as the candidate of his party for United States Senator. He was elected the following day at the joint session of the Legislature to succeed his old time political adversary David B. Hill. So Mr. Platt was to be inaugurated as a United States Senator on March 4, 1897, the day on which Mr. McKinley was to be inaugurated as President.

General FRESHING has accepted Father Knickerbocker's invitation to be his guest, and Father Knickerbocker is wondering whether he will be allowed to open a bottle of something stronger than spring water in honor of the event.

The fair city of Detroit for a long time had a run of good luck as strong as the current of the river which separates it from Canada. But now, soon after that six cents verdict, comes the news that JACK DEMAREST has selected that city for his home and future battling ground; that CRAYATH is lot footing after Com's batting average, and nothing in which sorrow can be drowned can now be run in across the Ohio line.

Just how far CARTER GLASS's plea for economy, even unto patched trousers, may lead us will probably not be realized until we are well in the political campaign of 1920. Must we look forward to a canvass in which no candidate will amount to shucks unless he can exhibit several bona fide patches?

and every addition to the family cuts deeper into this item." The family's outlay for rent varies, of course, according to the locality. The lowest income group questioned in Fall River paid \$105 a year; the highest income group in this city turned \$355 a year over to the landlord. A typical family with an income of \$1,350 a year pays about \$200 rent. The American worker is not so crowded in his living place as the British workman. What it costs to light, heat and furnish the American home is not stated, but Mr. MEKKEK believes that enough fuel is used so that the living room can be lived in during the winter and that the lighting is "probably sufficient."

In the outlay for care of health, insurance, and amusement the divergence is wide, but a general average of the family doctor and medicine bill is \$50 a year, while about \$40 goes for insurance. Families in various conditions of prosperity were questioned as to their contribution to the treasury of the moving picture barons. Families in Philadelphia with an income of \$900 a year spent 38 cents at the movies; those with \$2,500 a year spent \$37.22. The average was \$12.40 a family in Philadelphia and \$9.23 in Boston. This proves, we suppose, the economy of literary culture.

Mr. MEKKEK's conclusion is that the satisfaction of believing that the American standard of living is the highest in the world is not enough. "Let us make the minimum living standard in America," he says, "one that will support life in decency and health." Well, there appear to be nine and forty theoretical ways of attaining this ideal condition, but the Government has not yet found the courage to make a beginning by knocking the artificial prop from beneath living costs by putting wheat on the market at the price it will naturally bring.

What Justice Newburger Means to New York. Tammany Hall has issued a statement assailing Justice NEWBURGER of the Supreme Court on his official record, thus attempting to square it with the thousands of voters, independents, Democrats and Republicans, whose wrath it aroused by refusing to renominate this satisfactory judicial officer.

The Tammany assault on Justice NEWBURGER will not convince the public. New York does not go to Tammany Hall for scientific, disinterested analyses of the records of its Judges. Tammany solicitude for the efficiency of Judges is too young and tender a plant to inspire confidence. Tammany statistics of reversals will not be accepted as final. Indeed, in the case of Justice NEWBURGER Tammany statistics will be rejected except in so far as they reveal Tammany fright caused by the storm of popular disapproval created by its attempt to unseat a Judge who merits reelection.

As to Justice NEWBURGER's record on the bench we have the testimony of four bar associations that it is good. We have the testimony of men who have sat long with him as Judges that it is good. This is expert testimony, uncolored by partisanship. It is the testimony of the legal profession, not the testimony of politicians. It is given disinterestedly, not extorted by fear of defeat at the polls. The Tammany attack on Justice NEWBURGER is the vituperative outbreak of scared politicians. The endorsement of Justice NEWBURGER by the legal profession is the deliberate tribute of informed and experienced experts to a worthy Judge.

The issue in Justice NEWBURGER's case far transcends his personal fortunes. It is not merely whether one individual or another shall hold judicial office. It is whether judicial officers shall be at the mercy of Tammany Hall, or shall be responsible only to the people. The decision is more of consequence to the public than it is to Justice NEWBURGER. Were he retired to private life to-day he would survive the change in his occupation. But if Tammany gains control of the bench every citizen will suffer because of the transfer of judicial power from the public court houses to the Tammany Wigwam in Fourteenth street.

"The Rank Is But the Guinea's Stamp."

"He thrust his head from the bedclothes and then seated himself on the bed. His nightgown was of mauve and heavily embroidered. FERDINAND wore gold bracelets on his arm, and rings, with rubies and other precious stones, on every finger."

Thus FERDINAND of Bulgaria, the fallen Fox of the Balkans, received the order to quit his refuge in one of his castles in Austria, issued by CHARLES, himself now a refugee. The Bulgarian czar, so self-styled, cried out for his son to bear witness he was not a traitor. "Kiki," he pleaded, "swear that your father was never a traitor!" Kiki, bemused with sleep, found no ready answer. His father was infuriated. "Kiki," he shouted, "get out! You're only an idiot!" A Bulgarian General in attendance on FERDINAND was called. Count von BERCHTOLD, formerly the Austrian Foreign Minister, repeated the order of expulsion and explained the necessity for immediate flight. FERDINAND, with his son KIKI—formally CYRILLE—and the faithful Bulgarian General, departed in a motor car, carrying with them the money FERDINAND had taken from Bulgaria.

A czar in negligee, with bracelets on his arm, rings on his fingers, frightened by his plight, furlons at his son, makes a grotesque figure not without its appeal to sympathy. But sympathy cannot run far with a feeling monarch who is abandoning his countrymen. NICHOLAS of Russia, from the disjointed accounts of his fall which are at hand, seems to have disclosed a certain manly dignity. But FERDINAND the Fox, his dream of a throne in Constantinople shattered, his arrogance gone, did not cut an inspiring figure. To judge by him the world will say royalty is a poor lot.

But were it to judge by ALANOR of Belgium the decision would be different. Here was a monarch who lived up to the best traditions of royal service. Simple, brave, devoted, persistent, he won the admiration of the world in war and holds it in peace. And GEORGE of England, differently placed, comported himself with dignity, observing the etiquette custom prescribed for Britain's nominal ruler, doing his part for the common good; a fine figure in troubled times.

Two BURNS who said it: I went along accompanied by the late Wilbur J. Chamberlain, also of THE SUN's staff in those days, Mr. Chamberlain and I had been assigned to write the inaugural ceremonies in the United States Senate and the scenes in Washington incident to the inauguration of Lodge.

It will be recalled easily by old time Republicans like Chauncey M. Depew, Francis Hendricks, J. Sloat Fassett, Bernard Biglin, John W. Dwight, George W. Aldridge and others now living that Senator Platt had been very much opposed to the nomination of Mr. McKinley in 1896. His opposition had been almost vicious. It took the form, he appeared on the scenes in St. Louis, of issuing from the Fifth Avenue Hotel vitriolic statements to the New York city newspapers in opposition to Mr. McKinley's nomination. Most of the interesting statements ran along for several months before the convention and were particularly specific in their charge that Mr. McKinley was not sound on the money question. Mr. Platt had been conversant with all the political movements and was strong for the McKinley nomination. Mr. Platt at St. Louis favored either the nomination for President of the late Thomas B. Reed or of Levi P. Morton, former Vice-President and then, 1896, Governor of New York. Mr. Morton is still living in New York City at the late age of 94. But Mark Hanna was too strong for the Platt-Reed-Morton forces. For several years Mr. Hanna, the personal friend and intimate of Mr. McKinley, had been organizing Republican forces in the nation in favor of McKinley's nomination, and Mr. Platt and his friends were easily defeated at St. Louis. It was the McKinley nomination that carried the delegates imbued with the 16 to 1 silver doctrine retired. After the nomination of Mr. McKinley no Republican then alive worked harder or contributed more than Mr. Platt in effort to the election of Mr. McKinley. And Mr. Platt was not without the Republican nomination in that year, 1896, the year in which they had a majority on joint ballot. In the following January, 1897, Mr. Platt in the joint caucus of Assemblymen and Senators received all but a few votes as the candidate of his party for United States Senator. He was elected the following day at the joint session of the Legislature to succeed his old time political adversary David B. Hill. So Mr. Platt was to be inaugurated as a United States Senator on March 4, 1897, the day on which Mr. McKinley was to be inaugurated as President.

General FRESHING has accepted Father Knickerbocker's invitation to be his guest, and Father Knickerbocker is wondering whether he will be allowed to open a bottle of something stronger than spring water in honor of the event.

The fair city of Detroit for a long time had a run of good luck as strong as the current of the river which separates it from Canada. But now, soon after that six cents verdict, comes the news that JACK DEMAREST has selected that city for his home and future battling ground; that CRAYATH is lot footing after Com's batting average, and nothing in which sorrow can be drowned can now be run in across the Ohio line.

Just how far CARTER GLASS's plea for economy, even unto patched trousers, may lead us will probably not be realized until we are well in the political campaign of 1920. Must we look forward to a canvass in which no candidate will amount to shucks unless he can exhibit several bona fide patches?

and every addition to the family cuts deeper into this item." The family's outlay for rent varies, of course, according to the locality. The lowest income group questioned in Fall River paid \$105 a year; the highest income group in this city turned \$355 a year over to the landlord. A typical family with an income of \$1,350 a year pays about \$200 rent. The American worker is not so crowded in his living place as the British workman. What it costs to light, heat and furnish the American home is not stated, but Mr. MEKKEK believes that enough fuel is used so that the living room can be lived in during the winter and that the lighting is "probably sufficient."

In the outlay for care of health, insurance, and amusement the divergence is wide, but a general average of the family doctor and medicine bill is \$50 a year, while about \$40 goes for insurance. Families in various conditions of prosperity were questioned as to