The Sun.

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1900.

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.

THE SUN, New York City.

PARIS—Kiosque No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and Kiosque No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

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.

A Year in Cuba.

In another page of THE SUN we print a report upon the present state of Cuba by Mr. CHARLES E. AKERS, a correspondent of the *London Times*. He is a practised observer of peoples in all portions of the world, and has had intimate personal knowledge of Cuba during the Spanish war and during the period of reconstruction immediately following.

After a year's absence Mr. AKERS has revisited Cuba and seen the result of American control. His interesting story is highly satisfactory from all points of view. It shows that the administration of the island on our part has been signally successful, and that the response to all the efforts in behalf of the Cubans, and to the opportunities that have come with the island's beginning of a new life has been hopeful and energetic, and effective in the way of self-help.

The expected friction between the Cubans and the Spaniards has not come. The expected friction between the Cubans and the negroes has not come. The expected friction between the Cubans and the Americans has not come. The realization that the Americans are there, not as conquerors, but in accordance with the declaration of Congress, reaffirmed by President MCKINLEY, as friends clothed with the responsibility of bringing Cuba, politically untrained and industrially prostrate, to the point where she can govern herself with the order and steadiness of a fully civilized state, is widespread and it breeds content and coöperation.

The account of Cuba brought by Mr. AKERS reflects great credit upon the Cubans, upon the Government of the United States, and upon its many distinguished agents on Cuban soil.

Princeton University.

The institution originally founded under the name of the College of New Jersey assumed in 1896 the title of Princeton University, although it does not comprise schools of law, medicine and theology. It comprehends, however, a school of science as well as the college proper, and it has attained proportions which, viewed in conjunction with its academic distinction, place it in the front rank of educational establishments in our Eastern States. We avail ourselves of the catalogue for the year 1899-1900 to indicate the requirements for admission and the courses of study offered to undergraduates. Of these 686 belong to the academic department and 367 to the School of Science.

We should first note that the whole number of undergraduates in Princeton University at the present time is 1,194; the rest are in the graduate department. The students are drawn from all parts of the Republic; indeed, there are eleven from foreign countries; but about two-thirds are contributed by Pennsylvania, New Jersey and New York. The former slave-holding States and the District of Columbia, with which, before the Civil War, Princeton used to be a favorite college, still send thither 170 young men. The proportion of the educational staff to the number of students is large, being about one to twelve; the professors, instructors and other university officers number 97. Remarkable, also, is the extent of the assistance given to needy and meritorious youth. There are 106 endowed scholarships worth from forty to two hundred dollars a year, besides the Stinnecke scholarship, which has an annual value of five hundred dollars and four competitive fellowships, the income of which ranges from two hundred dollars to about four hundred dollars per annum. There are also six fellowships, valued at from four hundred to five hundred dollars a year, which are open to the graduates of any American college, while the appointments are made, not by competitive examination, but upon a comparison of the academic records presented by the applicants. We should mention, too, twenty-eight prizes, which vary in value from ten to two hundred dollars; neither should we overlook the gold medals and valuable books which are annually awarded for proficiency in certain directions. There are some special funds established for the benefit of candidates for the ministry, and the amount of tuition remitted in the case of indigent and deserving students is now more than double the whole income from the scholarship and charitable endowments.

The prescribed conditions for admission to the academic department, or college proper, include a knowledge of English grammar and literature as well as of Latin grammar and Greek grammar and the ability to translate simple Latin and Greek into English prose. An applicant must also have read five books of CÆSAR'S Gallic War, six books of the Æneid and nine Orations of CICERO; the first four books of XENOPHON'S Anabasis and the seventh book of HERODOTUS or else three books of the Anabasis and three books of the Iliad; he will also be examined in elementary French or German, in algebra through the binomial theorem, in plane geometry, in mensuration of the triangle, parallelogram, trapezoid, regular polygons and circle, and in the use of the logarithms of numbers. These are the minimum requirements; candidates for admission to advanced standing are expected to translate easy Greek or Latin at sight and to demonstrate a knowledge of Greek and Latin geography, of Greek history down to the end of the Peloponnesian War, and of Latin history down to the Battle of Actium. Not only is a knowledge of Greek indispensable for entrance into the academic department of Princeton University, but the study of the same language as well as of Latin, is prescribed throughout the freshman and sophomore years. Not until the junior year is a candidate for the A. B. degree at liberty to discontinue the study of the classics.

In the School of Science at Princeton, on the other hand, applicants for admission to the course leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science are required to pass an examination in English identical with that which is prescribed for the academic department; also in arithmetic, in algebra through the binomial theorem and in plane and solid geometry. They are not required to offer Greek, but must show a knowledge of Latin grammar and the ability to translate simple English into Latin; they must have read, moreover, five books of CÆSAR'S Gallic War and four orations of CICERO. It is further to be noted that an applicant for admission to the School of Science must pass an examination in both French and German grammar, and must be able to translate easy prose in both of those languages. After entering the school, all candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Science pursue the same studies until the end of the sophomore year; Latin is a prescribed study during the freshman year and both German and French are required studies until the close of the sophomore year. It should be observed that candidates for the degree of Electrical Engineer or of Civil Engineer may be admitted to the School of Science without any knowledge of Latin, and the study of that language is not required during any of the four years covered by the course in civil engineering or in electrical engineering.

While there is thus room in the School of Science at Princeton for those who have no desire to study Greek or even Latin, a knowledge of both the classical languages is indispensable to the attainment of the degrees of Bachelor of Arts or of Master of Arts at this university. The degree of Doctor of Philosophy may be conferred upon any Bachelor of Arts of any approved institution, the academic course of which is equivalent to that pursued in Princeton, provided he has spent at least two years in exclusive study for the degree, one of which years must be spent in Princeton.

Southern Sentiment About the Treaty.

The South is naturally anxious for the construction of the interoceanic canal by the Government. No part of the country has a more obvious interest, commercially, in the early consummation of the project. Senator MORGAN'S zeal represents public opinion generally in the States of the Gulf, the lower Mississippi, and the southern Atlantic coast.

Judging from the expressions of leading Southern newspapers, solicitude in that quarter for the speedy passage of the Hepburn bill has to some extent obscured the gravity of the considerations involved in Mr. HAY'S proposition.

The *Atlanta Constitution*, for example, recently argued that although the treaty is "most unfortunate in formation and purpose," "a criminal blunder," and "utterly to be condemned," it would be better to ratify it rather than lose the canal. The *Constitution* went so far as to suggest that the treaty might well be ratified and subsequently repudiated:

"Let us not allow a grave public question of practical improvement to be jeopardized by the discussion of an academical problem which American guns can settle at any time that a settlement becomes necessary!

"Let the canal be built!

"Let the bill for that purpose be passed!

"Let it go on its way with American capital behind it, with American enterprise to push it through, and with the American mind made up that, no matter what treaties may say, the canal will be ours, whenever the practical question is raised.

"Even if it be necessary to adopt the treaty, obnoxious though its provisions be, let not that act stand in the way. The canal is what we want, it is what we must have, and it is the object which our statesmen must keep in mind, reserving polemical questions for another stage.

"Therefore, it would be well to remember that there are two questions before Congress: One a practical one, backed by every American sentiment, to build the canal; the other, a mere paper treaty, which should not have been made, but which having been made, if it becomes necessary to adopt it as it is, to do so rather than endanger the first and leading object."

This view of the matter will hardly satisfy the *Constitution* itself when it comes to examine the question more calmly. To pass the Canal bill and commit the Government definitely to the construction of an American canal is one thing. To ratify the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty renouncing forever American control over the canal is another thing. The first thing does not depend on the second thing; and no honorable American, after deliberate consideration, is likely to favor the idea of ratifying the treaty in order to push the Hepburn bill, and then defiantly tearing up the treaty later on.

The first thing thing to get out of the way is the proposed compact by which we prevent the canal from ever being American. We are glad to observe in the South signs of changing sentiment with regard to the treaty. The *Times-Democrat* of New Orleans now says:

"The proposition which is incorporated in the Hay-Pauncefote amendment to the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, is one that will have to be scrutinized closely before it is accepted. The proposition, stated in the rough, is that, by the special grace of Great Britain, the United States shall be allowed the luxury of building an isthmian canal entirely at its own expense; and, after building the canal, the United States shall neutralize it and maintain its neutrality in war as in peace, and make it free to the commerce of all nations as to its own!

"This would be a somewhat expensive honor that Messrs. HAY and PAUNCEFOTE intend for the United States in their treaty; and the Senate will no doubt have a word to say as to whether, in the first place, we need foreign permission or foreign assistance to build a canal, or whether, in the next place, we care to build a canal at all but such a one as shall be at all times our own and under our exclusive control."

That is the American view; and the South's interests, commercial and patriotic, in the preservation of absolute American control over the canal are precisely the same as those of the rest of the Union.

Boston Authors' Club, Limited.

Lying rumor with its myriad tongues has busied itself overmuch of late with the authors' club that has been formed in Boston. It has proclaimed that the club had been dissolved, with added circumstance of haughty exclusiveness; it has spread tales of supersensitive authors declining to enter the club or to serve on its committees; it has even denied that the club ever existed. To all such reports, born of envy, we take pleasure in putting an end authoritatively. We have still greater pleasure in presenting to our readers Boston's newest roll of fame. The Boston Authors' Club exists; it has many members, there are seventy of them already; it has the committee on admissions recently described in THE SUN, and it has that indispensable fundamental of every club, a constitution. From that document we quote:

"Article I. Section 1. The Boston Authors' Club, limited to one hundred members, is organized for the purpose of promoting social intercourse among the Authors of Boston and vicinity."

The question of what constitutes an author, presenting itself at the outset, is met manfully and without ambiguity:

"Article III. Section 4. Any author of a published book shall be eligible for membership, subject to the approval of the Membership Committee."

There is no room here for social or personal prejudice. An author is one who has succeeded in having a book published; no number of letters written to the *Boston Evening Transcript* or the *Boston Budget* will do, if uncollected. A severe test, but not unjust. The published book must then be approved by a committee and the approved author be found acceptable for social intercourse by his fellow authors. These steps were needful to enhance the value of membership and to restrict the numbers of the club to less than one hundred thousand.

What then is the result of this process of selection? Who are the lights that illumine the Boston of 1900? A reflection from an earlier day we find in Mrs. JULIA WARD HOWE, Mrs. ABBY MORTON DIAZ, Mrs. EDNAH D. CHENEY, Col. THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON, Mrs. and Mr. ELIZABETH STUART PHELPS WARD, names linked together by many a gallant fight against oppression to the negro, to woman, to the Indian, and in behalf of the many reforms that Massachusetts has endeavored to enforce upon stubborn humanity—names that inevitably recall the longer list of those who fought with them and are gone to their rest. With them we are glad to see still Mr. J. T. TROWBRIDGE, whose "Cudjo's Cave" delighted our boyhood, Dr. W. J. ROLFE, the editor of SHAKESPEARE, Mr. ARTHUR GILMAN, the foster father of the Harvard Annex and the editor of CHAUCER, Prof. DOLBEAR, the scientific beacon light of Tufts College and a few more landmarks of the older Boston. Naturally, too, we find in the club, almost ex officio, the editors of the main outlets of New England authorship, the *Boston Evening Transcript*, the *Youth's Companion* and the *Atlantic Monthly*. About them clusters a bevy of fair women, whose names may be seen with greater or less frequency in magazines or on the covers of thin little volumes bearing unfamiliar imprints. Many of the names are parted in the middle. It would be invidious to dwell on one rather than another. Among them, however, is the youthful President of Wellesley College, *fin de siècle* despite herself and her chronological calculation. As was to be expected from Boston and Massachusetts, the women make up the majority of the club. The quality and quantity of New England woman authorship never has been open to doubt. It is about the younger men who to-day bear Boston's burden of literary fame that a pardonable curiosity has been aroused, which we are glad to be able to gratify. Here they are in alphabetical order:

CHARLES FOLLEN ADAMS,	ALBERT BUSHNELL HART,
OSCAR FAY ADAMS,	CLARENCE HAWKES,
SAMUEL J. BARROWS,	EDWARD PATSON JACKSON,
ELBRIDGE BROOKS,	HENRY D. LLOYD,
JAMES BUCKHAM,	JUSTIN H. SMITH,
GELETT BURGESS,	FRANK P. STEARNS,
HEZEKIAH BUTTERWORTH,	T. RUSSELL SULLIVAN,
GEORGE W. COOKE,	WILLIAM R. THAYER,
NATHAN HASKELL DOLE,	DAVID P. TODD,
SAM WALTER FOSS,	HERBERT D. WARD,
ROBERT GRANT,	WILLIAM O. WARD,
EDWIN A. GROSVENOR,	ASHTON R. WILLARD.

A remarkable list which the Chevalier FULLER will find hard to match in Cook county.

Here, *facile princeps inter pares*, is his Honor Judge ROBERT GRANT, happily at last himself *deusculus stanneus rotalis*. Here is Mr. GELETT BURGESS, bard and limner of the Purple Cow, to whom we owe the prevalent Early Infantile movement in Letters and the Arts. Here is Mr. NATHAN HASKELL DOLE, deviser of the doleite system of translations from unknown tongues and founder of multivariorum omarkhayyamism, whose ingenuous confessions in "Mistakes We Make" have won a place beside the "Portuguese Phrase Book." Here are two ADAMSES, the poet of "Little YAWCOB STRAUSS" and the expounder of BROWNING to out-of-town sewing circles; and two Amherst professors to represent the Emily Dickinson school of thought, child of the Connecticut Valley. We need not comment on other names famous in Boston and "vicinity," some of which may have for our readers the charm of novelty. We ourselves confess that we might know more than we do, for instance, of the works of Mr. JAMES BUCKHAM of Atlantic or of Mr. CLARENCE HAWKES of Hadley. It is peculiarly gratifying to note the presence in the club of Mr. SAM WALTER FOSS, the sweet singer of Somerville. It refutes the slanderous insinuation that a man's abode is ground for ostracism in Boston, and leaves hope open even to residents of the Lower Port of Cambridge.

Nothing human is perfect, it is true, and even in this list there are noticeable omissions. An esteemed correspondent has already called attention to the absence of Prof. ARLO BATES with his whiff of fire. In the editorial trefoil the fourth lucky leaf seems lacking, namely, the editor of the late MOSES DOW'S philanthropic *Waverley Magazine*, that crowning glory of East Boston and escape pipe for much irrepressible New England literary steam. If Mr. WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER, editor of the *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, is admitted to the club, why not his great precursor, MOSES KING? Why not more ADAMSES, when the scourgers of college fetiches and of Puritan iniquities are within reach? Where is Prof. BARRETT WENDELL, the gynophilist, who has made SHAKESPEARE illustrious by his approval? Where, too, is the football strategist and philosopher who turned the mind of Boston to self-introspection by the ever-present question from which there was no escape: "Do you wear pants?"

Other gaps in the roll of fame will doubtless occur to many, but criticism should not be overhasty. Some Boston authors, it should be remembered, form whole clubs in themselves. Mr. GAMALIEL BRADFORD alone would overflow many clubs. Moreover the Boston Authors' Club has not closed its lists. Of its one hundred members there are but seventy chosen as yet, so that there is plenty of room for more immortals. There seems to be no reason, besides, why other authors' clubs, not, of course, of equal distinction, should not be formed. Boston's crop of authors is plentiful and should be garnered.

No doubt from their celestial Beacon Hill, the departed Olympians of Boston are now smiling at their gregarious epigones. The outside world can only envy the output of thought required for social intercourse among these pinnacles of fame.

Football and the Cornell Biologist.

Prof. BURT G. WILDER of Cornell has been kind enough to send us a tremendous collection of printed and typewritten matter about intercollegiate football, a sport which has not been fortunate enough to win his approval. In his plain Anglo-Saxon language, it is a "descent from athletophily to athletomania." He sends us a combined bibliography and syllabus of the subject, and seems anxious to disseminate his views. He began to give them before the men now playing college football were born; and the greater the popularity of the game the greater grows his aversion to certain incidents and accidents of it which he regards as objectionable.

We venerate his industry, but it is wasted on us. We accept intercollegiate football as a robust institution and an interesting fact. The regulation of it is a matter for each college or for all the colleges in which it is played, to decide. Occasional scientific protests, and frequent heated unscientific protests are made against it. But here it is growing heartier and more prosperous every year; and we should no more think of discussing the pros and cons of it with the accomplished Cornell biologist or anybody else than of discussing the Rev. JOHN JASPER'S attractive solar theory.

But there must be earnest souls that hold with the Hon. WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON that football is the source of war and woe in general. There must be eager seekers for that information which Prof. WILDER possesses in such abundance and is so willing to impart. To all these hungry hearts we say: Write to BURT G. WILDER, M. D., Ithaca, N. Y. He says that "all the published articles are open to discussion, and corrections as to facts and dates will be welcomed. Copies of the articles will be given or loaned, if desired." Thus he is willing to become the head of a sort of "correspondence university" for the study of intercollegiate football. Write him and learn how, "in respect to athletic contests, reason and experience indicate that between the intracollegiate and the intercollegiate forms the distinctions are substantially as between recreation and distraction, liberality and extravagance, emulation and hostility, zeal and ferocity, music and noise, enthusiasm and hysterics, hilarity and rowdyism, moderation and excess."

It is a happiness to us to assist, even in a humble way, to give a gentleman with views the opportunity of airing them. Do not forget the address: BURT G. WILDER, M. D., Ithaca, N. Y.

A Shallow and Insulting Professor.

Prof. SUMNER of Yale University has as his specialty "Political and Social Science," a mere name, for there is no such science, and he seems to have a special adaptation to it, for he is a sensational and haphazard philosopher without scientific method. Prof. SUMNER, therefore, is just the sort of man from whom we might expect the shallow generalization he made before the senior class of Yale last Thursday that "not more than 10 per cent. of married people, looking back at the end of their lives, can honestly say they have realized all the happiness and all the ideals with which they began married life."

If that is science this professor of "Political and Social Science" can give us the facts on which he bases his conclusion; but, of course, he has no such facts. They are unobtainable, and he gave these boys nothing except a baseless and unprovable assertion. Even if it was true, however, of what possible scientific or philosophic value would it be? What evidence does it afford of any fault in the state of matrimony?

Nobody realizes "all the happiness and all the ideals" with which he began in life, whether they relate to marriage or anything else. High ideals can never be realized. They are the vision of a perfection impossible to humanity, the light that is always shining ahead, but to which no man can attain, unless they are low and mean ideals. The ideal person as conceivable by the poetical imagination does not exist; the ideal state is an impossible dream. The world moves ahead because man is never satisfied, never attains his ideal, but must always strive unavailingly to reach "all the happiness" conceivable by him.

As to marriage, however, the ideals with which people start out are at bottom selfish, self-centred, and they ought not to be realized. The true success or failure of a marriage is not in the happiness of the husband and wife, but in the happy result in the family which arises from it. The happiness of the generation that is coming up, not of the generation that is passing away, affords the true test of marriage. The one sows in sorrow and suffering, that the other may reap in joy. The great bond in matrimony, beginning with absorbing affection between the pair, becomes common parental affection. Ideals of happiness which were self-centred at the beginning are centred in the children in the end.

Viewed in that light, instead of there being only 10 per cent. of happy marriages there are only 10 per cent. of unhappy marriages. How is it with the young men addressed by Prof. SUMNER? Why are they at Yale? Are the marriages of the parents who sent there the boys insulted by Prof. SUMNER—the great part of them at the cost of much self-denial at home—to be set down as having failed in realizing the proper ideal in marriage so far as it is possible to man to approach it? What else should be that ideal except to get happiness from the family, for the building up of which in pain and self-renunciation marriage was instituted?

Bryan's Anti-Trust Conference.

A clever Hoosier stateswoman, Mrs. HELEN M. GOUGAR, described the "non-partisan" Anti-Trust Conference held at Chicago last week, when she implored the delegates to "be non-partisan and vote for BRYAN." Grand, gloomy, and peculiar, the Hon. IGNATIUS DONNELLY watched the successful efforts of the Bryan men to make the thing a Bryan side show. The Middle-of-the-Roaders stormed in vain. ALTGELD and WILLIAMS and LENTZ, TOWNE and WEAVER and WARNER, the sentries of the three Bryan camps, Democratic, Silver-Republican and Populist, did their work. There was a handful of unclassified cranks and a patch or two of straight Populism, but the convention was BRYAN'S. Whether it was worth all the railroad fare and hotel bills it cost is another matter.

It is significant of the tendencies of Bryanism that the platform of this Bryanized convention calls for Government railroads, telephones and telegraphs. The matchless leader may yet be crowded into accepting a programme even more radical than the Chicago platform.

Many unintentionally comic speeches were made, but the height of humor was the general wail of the speakers. In an amazingly prosperous country they could see nothing but the prospect of disaster. It was a convention of ghost seers.

The Mambrino helmet of the gentle Knight of La Mancha shines brightly once more. A maligned profession has been restored to honor. A decision in the Court of Queen's Bench proclaims that the barber chirurgeon exercises a profession and not a trade. Some zealous Sabbatarians of Wolverhampton complained that a barber and hairdresser in that town shaved on Sunday, in violation, as they alleged, of the British Sabbath law, the statute 29 CHARLES II., and the stipendiary Magistrates, applying the law to the barber, fined him three shillings and sixpence. From their sentence he appealed. The Act, he showed, prohibits "any tradesman, artificer, workman, laborer, or other person whosoever, from carrying on his ordinary calling on the LORD'S Day, works of necessity and charity alone excepted." He waived the point that shaving may be "a work of necessity or charity" and asked the Court to decide whether barbers came within the intention of the Act or not. Mr. Justice CHAUNELL was of opinion that they did not. He showed why they were not tradesmen or artificers or workmen or laborers and held that the words of the statute, "other person whosoever," must apply only to persons of like or inferior condition. The barber, who, in King CHARLES II.'s time was in a much more important position, could not be included in the words used. Mr. Justice BUCKNILL, in concurring, said that in the days of CHARLES II. the barber was the only person entitled to let blood. He was as much a surgeon as a barber. There is poetic justice in a demand for the enforcement of an antiquated law bringing about a judicial eulogy of the past glories of an honored craft.

The Hon. ARTHUR PUE GORMAN'S brief for the Democratic party will not increase the Democratic conviction of his wish to see Col. BRYAN elected President. Here is a sentence with a palpable wink in it:

"I think that the passage of the Gold Standard bill will also help us, because it will remove all danger of the free coinage of silver and will bring back to the Democratic ranks those who left it in 1896 on the silver issue."

"Elect us because the Republicans have prevented us from doing any harm:" that would be a bold and an inspiring cry for the Democrats. And the election of a Democratic President and House of Representatives would be a queer way of showing that all danger of the free coinage of silver has been removed. That danger must remain great as long as there are millions of voters anxious to bring it on. But probably Mr. GORMAN is sardonically advertising the fatal weakness of his party.

IN SOUTH AFRICA.

The despatches received from Lord Roberts's headquarters at Jacobsdal since yesterday only convey one important fact regarding the Boer movements after the passage of Gen. French's mounted column across the Modder River to Kimberley, which is that a large Boer force, said to be under Gen. Cronje, was retreating to Bloemfontein followed by Gen. Kelly-Kenny's division with artillery under Gen Kitchener. This is contained in a SUN special message, and an official despatch received by the British War Office gives details of the capture of a quantity of war material and stores belonging to Gen. Cronje's laager, during the pursuit. The whole Boer force that was between Kimberley and Modder River does not seem, however, to have taken that line of retreat, as one force is said to have moved off to the northwest, which would be toward Barkly West across the Vaal River. But if, as is likely, Gen. French is operating in that direction from Kimberley their retreat on that side would be cut off, and they would have to make for some of the western drifts to get across the Vaal River lower down and escape out of the angle formed by it and the Riet River. The absence of any news of the capture of guns shows that the Boers had prepared for the present eventuality some time ago, and had carried their artillery to some of the fortified positions they are said to have got ready. The essential thing, however, for the moment is that the force investing Kimberley has been dispersed and that the avenues of escape on the west are apparently occupied by British troops, a principal one, that by Koodoes Drift to Douglas, being in the hands of Gen. Macdonald's brigade. The reported capture of a large British convoy by a Boer force coming from Colesberg with ten guns, south of the Riet River, is important, and the confirmation of it will be interesting, for there had been no previous intimation of its existence. Should it be correct, it would show that it was detached from that point when the absence of Gen. French's cavalry brigade from the neighborhood of Colesberg was discovered. It has, however, arrived on the scene too late to help to impede or arrest the operations since accomplished.

The Boers at Stormberg are again moving and, according to a despatch, attacked the British position at Molteno yesterday morning, probably in concert with the movements about Arundel, to which place the British have retired from Rensburg with some loss, the Boers also having experienced many casualties.

A despatch states that Gen. Buller has again moved to the westward from Chieveley and renewed his attack on Vaal Krantz, across the Tugela, but that the Boers are holding their own. This report comes from Lorenzo Marques and needs confirmation, as there has been no previous indication of a British movement of any kind in Natal since the abandonment of the turning movement to the west from which so much was expected. It would not be surprising, however, were a fresh attempt to be made to reach Ladysmith to save the situation, and absolve the British Government of the charge of having thought more of the Kimberley diamond mines and Mr. Cecil Rhodes, than of the British division that has so gallantly maintained a far more arduous defence than anything that Kimberley has been called on to make. But the chief interest is, of course, in the operations now going on under Lord Roberts's direct orders, as their result must affect more or less the duration of the campaign. Should Gen. Kitchener succeed in breaking up Gen. Cronje's force and reaching Bloemfontein, the Boer commandos south of the Orange River would be cut off, and out of the fighting for the rest of the war.

Dunraven's Method of Recruiting.

From the Dublin United Irishman.

Lord Dunraven is an excellent type of a mean class. Recently this "gentleman" dismissed a number of his workmen at Askeaton, *all under forty years of age*, and his lordship's wife went among them telling them that as they would not get work in the district they should all join the British Army. These men were dismissed, we believe, solely in order to force them into the ranks of England's battered soldiery through fear of starvation. Not one of them, we are glad to say, "took the shilling" from her ladyship. If the farmers of the district do not provide employment of some sort for these unfortunate fellows they will deserve the contempt of all Irishmen.

Can There Be a Fresh-Air "Hog?"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* No doubt you have casually heard of a species of individual called the Mount Vernon hog, but I have lately had occasion to notice not quite so rude and abrupt a specimen but a more heartless one. There is a commuter on the New Haven road, whose abode is New Rochelle, I think of foreign birth, who insists on having fresh air these cold mornings and evenings, by opening a window. He keeps his overcoat on and is entirely unconcerned as to the comfort of the other passengers, and when the trainsman remonstrates as to his selfish and brutal practice, he feels put out about it. I shall endeavor to obtain his name and publish it. Evidently he must be a man of some influence because he is much sought after by a certain element of the same town to whom his barbarous whim causes amusement. The passengers going further up the road, who remove their overcoats, are subject to an attack of pneumonia caused by the chilly condition of the car, and the fact that they are gentlemen who avoid notoriety, compels them to endure this hardship rather than to subject themselves to insult at the hands of this brute.

I had occasion to complain to the Superintendent of the road last winter, when on a winter night two so-called ladies felt very warm on account of keeping their wraps on and other very apparent causes, and insisted on keeping their window open to the great discomfort of the other passengers. When the conductor called their attention to the matter they simply told him to request the parties complaining "to put on their overcoats." The Superintendent replied that affairs of this kind were left to the passengers themselves to be adjusted. Under these conditions how do you suggest to treat this case, a club or a gun? A SUBURBANITE.

NEW YORK, Feb. 15.

Military Conscription in England.

From the Medical Record.

As is well pointed out in an editorial in the *London Lancet* of Dec. 23 the trade of Germany does not appear to have been disastrously handicapped by her military system, and in so far as the physique and general health of her population are concerned has greatly benefited by conscription. The greater part of the inhabitants of Great Britain live in cities and towns, and the melancholy truth that the population as a whole has deteriorated physically owing to this cause is too obvious to be lightly ignored. Two or three years of healthy army life, followed at just that age when a man especially needs to live under favorable sanitary conditions, would do much toward improving the British town-dweller mentally and physically. That the question of conscription is thought worthy of consideration even in Great Britain is a sign of the trend of public opinion, and the Boer war, be the result what it may, will have the effect of making the British "place their house in order."

AGAINST THE TREATY.

The Avalanche of Good Americanism Which Mr. Hay's Proposition Has Started.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* If one would take a practical view of international questions, he must dismiss from consideration all thought as to the probable effect which the disposition of them might have upon internal party politics.

Now, the plain question is this: What is the interest of England which induces her to protest against the fortification of the Nicaragua Canal?

The concession to England's demand finds its justification in the presumption that we shall always be on friendly terms with her Government. The question, then becomes, a purely commercial one, for in the present state of affairs no one may fairly deny that we are able to defend the waterway, unfortified, against any other single power in its present naval strength.

But the friends of the proposed treaty are bound to prove that no such issue can arise before we ought to rely upon the supposed concessions or the fancied future favor of the British Government.

It is a palpable fact that England is raising Kingston to the rank of a first-class naval station. What is the purpose of this act? Are her interests in that quarter sufficiently threatened by any powerful nation? Taken in connection with her strenuous insistence upon the terms of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, this act admits of but one illation. England fortifies the station in sufficient strength to make it a convenient base of operations; and the purpose of strengthening that base is to give her a commanding position over the waterway if we should be involved in hostilities with her.

This palpable aim on the part of the British Government has seemed to have no effect upon the Administration. Its apologists having read a few remarks of disapproval in the press, immediately disclaim all intention of making it a party measure without proceeding to disavow or withdraw it entirely. Is this the care which our rulers bestow upon our vital interests—to commit the Government to a course which may eventually result in a calamity the extent of which none at present can foresee? The British object is plain: England will treat Nicaragua as she did Egypt—for the sake of humanity, perhaps—while the commanding influence of this nation as the great power of this continent suffers an irreparable setback.

In conclusion, permit me to say that no past merit of any politician can commend him to the suffrage of our people if he commits this Government to such a scheme. Although a member of the party which put the present Administration in power, I believe the treaty to be fraught with peril to our country, and any politician or party committing us to such a course will have opportunity keenly to regret it. A READER OF THE SUN.

SYRACUSE, Feb. 15.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In common with my American countrymen, I am boiling in reference to this "Hay-Pauncefote treaty or bargain."

If this colossal stupidity goes through it will be to America's remorse.

Where the mighty English Empire has been defeated mentally and physically by "Dutch" farmers in Africa, is not a deuce spot compared to the victory obtained over our statesman.

If we are going to build this canal, let us do it by ourselves. DANIEL S. SHEEHAN.

WALLINGFORD, Conn., Feb. 14.

From the New Haven Palladium.

There is developing a tremendous amount of opposition to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty concerning the Nicaragua Canal. It appears to have been one of those compromises in which England gets the whole, and the United States nothing. The treaty concedes to the United States the right to build the canal—the whole of it—but it is to remain neutral in war as well as peace, and always open to the uses of foreign navies and commerce. That is to say, this country is to pay for the canal, and give England the free use of it. It is not to be fortified under any circumstances, either in peace or war.

One by one the Republican newspapers of the country are joining in opposition to its ratification by the Senate. It is likely to detract very seriously from Secretary Hay's reputation as a statesman.

From the Chicago Tribune.

It is certain the people of the United States will not consent to the spending of $140,000,000, getting nothing in return except the benevolent patronage of foreign nations in American affairs and an assurance of their willingness to interfere in those affairs when interference will be most troublesome and dangerous to ourselves—in case of war. The more the treaty is examined the less its discussion tends to promote forbearance and moderation of statement.

From the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

The building of the Nicaragua Canal is purely a matter between us and Nicaragua; and no European nation has any more right to interfere in it than we would have to impose conditions on the construction of the Suez Canal.

The South is vastly interested in the building of this canal across Nicaragua, and the primal consideration with it is to have the work done. England has no right to impose any conditions upon our enterprise, and we do not believe the people of the South would tolerate any. We should go right along with the construction of the canal and let that violated treaty take care of itself; and if it comes to an issue, England will find it rather difficult to adduce just grounds for the enforcement of a compact, which she herself has flagrantly dishonored.

From the Chicago Inter Ocean.

As the treaty stands, it is absolutely impossible. It betrays a lack of sagacity, caution, and diplomatic intelligence which even the *Inter Ocean* would not before have attributed to the present Secretary of State.

From the Rochester Union and Advertiser.

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty should be rejected because it is in direct violation of the Monroe doctrine. It invites the European powers to take part in the regulation of American affairs. An agreement embodying such an invitation is not to be thought of. Such benefit as this country might derive from the building of the canal would not begin to compensate for its renunciation of the Monroe Doctrine, and the ratification of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty would be, practically, such a renunciation. If we are bound by the blundering Clayton-Bulwer Treaty—which, by the way, Great Britain has violated—and cannot build a canal across the isthmus of Nicaragua without submitting to restrictions as to its control then let the canal not be built. If Great Britain refuses to agree to such modifications of the treaty as will give us complete control of the canal let us notify her that under no other conditions shall it be built. Such notification would undoubtedly bring her to terms, for she needs the canal. If it should not bring about the desired abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty we can do without the canal. We should have to build a few more warships than we should otherwise build, so as to protect our Pacific coast. With a powerful navy we can do without the canal. It is far better to build a few extra warships than renounce the Monroe Doctrine by inviting European powers to take part in the control of our affairs, as the Hay-Pauncefote treaty does.

From the San Francisco Chronicle.

It is evident that the terms of the new treaty concluded with Great Britain in regard to an isthmian canal meet with the profound disapprobation of the American people. It is not too much to say that the question involved might easily become the dominating question of American politics, in the face of which such subjects as trusts, currency and even expansion would be reduced to insignificance. Stated in its simplest form the question involved is whether the United States, with the concurrence of Nicaragua and Costa Rica, may build an isthmian canal across the territories of those two republics without leave asked of Great Britain or anybody else. The mere statement of the question in that form is sufficient to make the blood of every American citizen boil with indignation. A political party which should go to the people defending the negative of that proposition would be buried so deep that no trace of it would ever be found. Did France and England ask the consent of the United States when they dug the Suez Canal? Are not this country and the Central American States free agents? At what time since 1876 did Great Britain acquire suzerainty over any of them? We warn our statesmen at Washington that it needs but a spark to set the country in a blaze on this question.

From the Boston Traveler.

The building of an unfortified canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific through this continent would be simply a gift to any nation with which in the future we might be unfortunate enough to be at war. If the navy of such a nation was superior to ours it would have at its disposal an easily reached waterway which would enable her ships to wreak signal damage on our Pacific coast. The Caribbean Sea is of such wide extent that it would be a simple matter to slip by naval vessels on watch there.

Such a situation as would be brought about by the building of the canal under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty would be of greater advantage to Great Britain than to any other nation with which we might be at war, for she possesses in British Honduras a base of supplies that would put her fleets on an equal basis with any that we could send forth.

If the treaty is ratified we are simply equipping Great Britain at great cost.

THE MOLINEUX VERDICT.

A Card From Dr. Allan McLane Hamilton.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I have within the past few days been credited with certain remarkable statements regarding the use of hypnotism in the Molineux case, which it is hardly necessary to say are absurd and untrue. I have forborne until the end of the trial from expressing myself in any way, but now that the unfortunate defendant has been sentenced, I trust you will permit me to express my opinion of the unfairness of the trial and of the deplorable state of public feeling which led many to persecute and misjudge the prisoner, even at a time when he was willingly making every effort to aid the authorities in detecting the true criminal. It is to be regretted that popular prejudice has, as usual, been stirred to its depths and that certain newspapers have sedulously and malignantly put into circulation many stories regarding the prisoner's life and habits, which have generally taken root in receptive minds. Not only has this filthy stuff been found to have no foundation when investigated, but despite the persistent efforts of the prosecution there is no legal evidence in the case of any misconduct upon the part of the prisoner. My connection with the case lasted for many weeks and I must frankly say that not in thirty years' experience have I ever known a trial which has been so loosely and unfairly conducted, and where the rights of the prisoner have been so disregarded.

When I remember the dignified conduct of the Carlyle Harris and other cases by a former Recorder and prosecuting officers, the rough license employed by the present Assistant District Attorney in the Molineux case, who lost no occasion to insult and taunt the opposing counsel and to make remarks that would not be permitted elsewhere, forms an exceedingly disagreeable contrast. He was rarely corrected for this, and it is strange that his behavior and utterances should have had the weight they apparently has with a jury selected for its intelligence and respectability. The hapless prisoner has not, I believe, had any chance whatever, and upon many occasions the Recorder not only refused to listen to the objections of his counsel, which were made in the most respectful manner, but even went so far as to forbid the stenographer to take down perfectly valid and proper objections made by Mr. Weeks.

The prisoner's lawyers constantly labored to stem the tide of irrelevant and clearly improper testimony, and they are certainly deserving of the sympathy of all lovers of fair play for a plucky fight, which I believe will succeed in the end. As to the mental attitude of the jurors and the methods by which they arrived at their conclusion, it would be difficult for any psychologist successfully to analyze the exercise of reasoning power and judgment which led to the disregard of all absence of connecting pro