CURRENT TOPICS

JOHN BUNDREN, one hundred and one years old, and Miss Rose McGuire, one hundred years old, will, on August 6, 1907, be united in marriage at Mr. Bundren's estate, near Tatesville, Tenn. An Associated Press dispatch from St. Louis says: "The announcement reveals a romance. Bundren and Miss McGuire were sweethearts in Tennessee in their youth. Her parents, of English descent, would not give consent for their marriage, and finally returned to England, taking their daughter along. Bundren went to California and acquired considerable wealth. He never married. From California he returned to Tennessee and bought his birthplace near Tatesville. He decided to hold a reunion of old friends on his estate this year and sent out numerous invitations. Not long ago he received a letter from Miss McGuire, who is still unmarried. Correspondence followed and he renewed his offer of marriage and was accepted. The date of the wedding and the reunion of friends has been set for August 6, on the bride's birthday anniversary, when she will be 100 years old. Bundren has long white hair and a flowing white beard. He does not smoke nor drink liquor, and apparently is hale and hearty. In June he will go to Preston, Lancastershire, to escort his intended bride to his Tennessee estate for the wedding. Young Mr. John Bundren of St. Louis, a namesake, will be best man."

THE ANNOUNCEMENT that Former President Grover Cleveland had started on his "usual semi-annual hunt for ducks" prompted Frederick A. Ober of Hackensack, New Jersey, to write to the New York Evening Post this letter: "I write to ask if you will not join with me, and with thousands of sportsmen all over the country, in protesting against this violation—if not of the law—of the advanced sentiment as respects the shooting of birds during their spring migration. I need not argue for this sentiment, for all true sportsmen agree that there are good reasons for abstaining from shooting at this season, which any one with common sense can understand, and any one with consideration for the unwritten law of fair-play can appreciate and respect. At this time, when the migratory wild fowl are on their way to northern breeding grounds, or about to start, every female now killed reduces by more than that single bird the number to return next autumn, when, only, the true sportsmen will shoot them. It was hoped that, inasmuch as Mr. Cleveland's own state of New Jersey has but recently endeavored to secure the passage of a law prohibiting spring shooting of every kind, this most distinguished citizen of that state would respect the sentiment that prompted it. It is a good one."

REFERRING to an article in The Commoner the New York World insists that there is no excuse for anybody's being puzzled over the World's attitude on the railroad question and explains: "Its position was stated clearly enough in an editorial printed March 22, 1906, advocating the Culberson amendment to the rate bill prohibiting railroads from contributing to campaign funds: 'Better no rate law at all than a rate law without the restriction imposed by the Culberson amendment. There is more than enough railroad influence in national politics now. There are more than enough railroad contributions to campaign corruption funds. It would be folly to increase the temptation without restricting the opportunities for corporation control.' In the light of last week's political developments Mr. Bryan himself must admit that this was a pretty sound argument."

THE Charleston, S. C., News and Courier intimated that there would be prejudice in the north against a southern candidate for president. The Houston, Tex., Post takes issue, saying: "Eyen in 1864 northern republicans voted for and elected a southern vice-president, and since the war both northern republicans and northern democrats have not hesitated to elect southern men to office. We go further and assert: Both northern democrats and northern republicans have been far more liberal in this respect than we of the south have been. For proof of the liberality of northern republicans, we point to the recent election of Joseph M. Dixon to the senate to succeed William A. Clark of Montana. Dixon is a young North Carolinian whose relatives fought for the confederacy. Another republican, Page Morris, a former Virginian, was a distinguished representative from Minnesota. And what have the northern democrats done to show their confidence in southern democrats? We point to William A. Harris, a confederate colonel who represented Kansas in the United States senate; to L. F. C. Garvin, a native of Tennessee, who served Rhode Island as governor; to Francis G. Newlands, a native of Mississippi, now a senator from Nevada; to General Roger A. Pryor, of the confederate army, who represented New York in congress; to John R. Fellows, who followed his service in the confederacy with many political honors in New York; to Bertram T. Clayton, a native of Alabama, who served New York in congress; to Rufus K. Polk of Tennessee, who served Pennsylvania in congress; to John H. O'Neall of South Carolina, who represented Indiana in congress; to John C. Bell of Tennessee, who represented Colorado in congress; and to many other southerners who have been honored by northern democrats with public office. The Post believes that when the democratic party in national convention decides to nominate a southern man of the right calibre the northern democrats will not only support him loyally, but that they will support him with more enthusiasm than can be aroused by scarcely any northern democrat now within the range of choice."

THOSE who imagine that they can understand the English language may be interested in reading a few paragraphs taken by the New York World from the report of a law suit printed in the London Times. The extract follows: "That concluded the case for the plaintiff. Mr. Levett then stated the case for Mrs. Jalland from a legal point of view. This was a life estate with a condition subsequent, and if the condition could not be fulfilled the gift was good. She could not become a widow; therefore the gift remained. In Sheppard's Touchstone, vol. 1, p. 122, there was a definition of a condition which covered this case. Here there was a true condition subsequent. In Fearne's Contingent Remainders, vol. 2, p. 4, a mixed condition subsequent was defined. In the same volume, at page 384, there was a passage which took him all the way home. It was this: 'If the condition is subsequent, as the estate to which it is annexed cannot be defeated by it, such estate is absolute in the first instance or afterwards becomes so. If the void condition is a mixed condition, the preceding estate intended to be annihilated by it is absolute in the first instance or afterwards becomes so; and the estate to arise or to be accelerated on the fulfillment of the condition cannot arise or be accelerated.' The hearing was adjourned till Monday."

PROFESSOR HOPKINS of Yale read a paper recently before the American Oriental society in session at Philadelphia. A Philadelphia newspaper dispatch says: "The paper was a history of the kiss as we know it. The learned professor traced it from its birth and proved that the earliest peoples and earliest times knew it not. That there might be no mistake he labelled the kiss of today 'the genuine kiss' and 'the perfect kiss.' Oddly enough; he finds that the genuine kiss was invented by a woman. The description is given in the epic of ancient India which treats of the science of love. 'She laid her mouth to my mouth,' recites the poet, 'and made a noise which gave me pleasure.' With that discovery, said Prof. Hopkins, grew the fashion which has since known no abatement. 'The early peoples,' he continued, 'knew nothing of the kiss in any form. Had they known of it they would have told something of it in the mass of records that has come down to us, for, surely, an act which conveys such pleasure could not have been forgotten. 'With the development of the genuine kiss, the sniff kiss disappeared, never to reappear. It has served its purpose and soon was forgotten."

JAMES H. LANCASTER, of New York, does not entertain a very high opinion of the cobbler's discovery. Writing to the New York Herald Mr. Lancaster says: "In your issues of yesterday and today I notice your description of an alleged new process for burning ashes, etc. This Altoona (Pa.) cobbler's supposed discovery is an exploded theory and one exploited here in New York for several years. It was called 'brillium,' and at the request of several finaciers I witnessed precisely similar demonstrations to those you describe at Altoona at a large private house in West Sixty-eighth street, near Central Park West, where the entire house was being heated during the winter months of 1904-1905. The results obtained appeared most satisfactory from partial investigation, but such was not borne out by careful research after studying various effects on the furnaces and the cost of the chemical admixtures used. From a 'promoter's' viewpoint and as a sensational topic it certainly has the necessary elements of a stock selling scheme. There it ends unless it is something far more than what this country cobbler and the New York shrewd 'discoverer' have accomplished. Tests were made of this 'ashes burning' method at a large manufacturing plant at Harrison, N. J., but the results failed to get it adopted, although the engineers and owners of the plant were great enthusiasts in the scheme when it was submitted for their consideration. As your descriptions of this alleged new discovery may inspire pecuniary losses to your numerous readers, I have deemed it wise to advise you as to a few incontrovertible facts relating to this attractive subject. If necessary I will enlarge on my investigations of the New York 'ashes and refuse burning' scheme and give you exact figures and the names and addresses of the persons then concerned. It was such an inviting scheme that a man with considerable engineering and chemical skill was induced to invest many thousands of dollars and months of valuable time in the exploitation of this 'promising' enterprise. The expected millions he had fully relied on quickly acquiring from his investment and abilities to launch the affair on the market have not, however, yet materialized."

SPEAKING at the Deemer dinner where Senator Knox's presidential boom was launched, Former Representative W. O. Smith of the Pennsylvania Twenty-seventh district said: "So long as the people of the Twenty-seventh district cling to the theory that congressional honors should be passed around, and that county lines are important, it will continue to be represented by apprentices like myself. What we need up there is for somebody like the heathen orator, who contended so persistently that 'Carthage must be destroyed' to make the destruction of the rotation system the burden of his song, even though he might be regarded as a self-seeking demagogue and a rude iconoclast who would deliberately demolish the sacred idols of a people.' In commenting upon the fact that Representative Deemer, during his three terms, had become a useful member of the committee on invalid pensions, upon whom Pennsylvania leaned heavily, Mr. Smith observed: 'Having served three terms in congress in the next congress he would have graduated as a full-fledged statesman and been eligible for appointment on one of the great committees. I, along with Doctor Samuel, was cut down in the flower of my legislative youth by the ruthless hand of rotation, and we are now about to be relegated to the ranks of congressional has-beens, and perhaps never-should-have-beens."

SECRETARY OF STATE ROOT, addressing the American society of international law at Washington, April 19, declared that there never was any danger of war between the United States and Japan growing out of the recent controversy regarding the segregation of the Japanese school children in the public schools in San Francisco. In his address, Secretary Root says: "The treaty of November 22, 1894, between the United States and Japan provided, in the first article: 'The citizens or subjects of each of the two high contracting parties shall have full liberty to enter, travel, or reside in any part of the territory of the other contracting party, and shall enjoy full and perfect protection for their persons and property. * * * In whatever relates to rights of residence and travel; to the possession of goods and effects of any kind; to the succession to personal estate, by will or otherwise, and the disposal of property of any sort and in any manner whatsoever which they may lawfully acquire, the citizens or subjects of each contracting party shall enjoy in the territories of the other the same privileges, liberties, and rights, and shall be subject to no higher imposts or charges in these respects than native citizens or subjects or citizens or subjects of the most favored nation.' The matter has been happily disposed of without proceeding to judgment in either case; but in the meantime there was much excited discussion of the subject in the newspapers and in public meetings and in private conversation.