BOILERS FOR THE NAVY.

THE AMERICAN TYPE ADOPTED BY REAR-ADMIRAL MELVILLE MEETS WITH FOREIGN APPROVAL.

Washington, Dec. 22 (Special).—There is probably no legislative body in the world whose membership includes so many eminent shipbuilders and engineers as the British Parliament, and these experts have rendered the Empire a great service in carefully scanning the navy estimates and studying the reports submitted by the Lords of the Admiralty. Projected naval legislation is therefore intelligently criticised before being enacted into law, for everything relating to the navy possesses a special interest for the loyal Briton. It has been because such practical and loyal technical experts have scrutinized the navy estimates that the material of the British Empire is so efficient, and when these men declare that the boiler question is now the paramount one in naval construction the subject may be considered as one of importance to every nation that aspires to naval power.

The British navy has practically settled upon the types of warship, armor, armament and machinery best adapted for its purpose, but the "battle of the boilers" is still going on. For temporary purposes the Admiralty policy has been to consider the Belleville boiler as the approved type for large ships, treating other types as experimental until they have shown that they possess some distinct superiority. There are substantial advantages in adhering as far as possible to one type of boiler for all ships. Artificers both in the ships and at the yards become more expert in the management and repair of a boiler that is in common use. There can be interchangeability of the spare parts and accessories when an accident occurs. There are so many advantages in having an approved type that it is the aim of all naval administrations to settle this question as quickly as possible. The decision of the Lords of the Admiralty to regard the Belleville boiler as the approved type for large ships has been, however, in opposition to the judgment of the engineering members of Parliament. Their protest, backed up by the great shipbuilders, has been so earnest that the battle is still on. It is because these men believe that boiler supremacy will be the deciding factor in the next naval war that they are insistent in their demands that the Belleville boiler shall be driven from the British warships.

This battle of the boilers has also been going on at Paris, Berlin, St. Petersburg and Washington, but the period has now been reached when, so far as each individual nation is concerned, a choice will have to be decided upon. The requirements of the navy are distinct from those of the mercantile marine. Without going into technical details, it need only be said that the cylindrical boiler has had to give way on the warship to the water tube type. The questions of weight, space occupied and endurance have caused the change.

TWO GROUPS NECESSARY.

Much progress has been made toward a decision. All naval Powers believe that there will be two distinct groups for warship purposes. The first group will have bent tubes, and will be peculiarly adapted for small and medium sized craft. There will be another group capable of doing continuous work, and this type will have straight tubes and will be installed on the large cruisers and battleships. No naval administration will probably ever attempt to select a bent tube type of particular design, and therefore the choice of the type will be left to the contractor. In the small craft the maximum power will only be required at intervals and for short periods, and this result can be secured from many designs. For the battleships and cruisers, however, there are military as well as professional reasons why an approved type should be settled upon, since protracted work will be demanded of these steam generators. The straight tube will be a necessity for this boiler. This decision is based upon theory as well as experience.

In the United States Navy the development of the water tube boiler has been conservative. Upon his advent into the office of Engineer-in-Chief of the Navy, in 1888, Rear-Admiral Melville immediately began giving careful consideration to the subject, for he clearly saw the trend of boiler design. The development was not so rapid as he desired, but it was speedier than his confreres approved. Three years from his induction into office Admiral Melville had designed and a contract had been made for a battery of water tube boilers for the monitor Monterey. The Monterey was of over four thousand tons displacement, and was the first warship of large size of any nation to be fitted with sufficient steam generators of the water tube type for cruising purposes. Before steaming for Manila the Monterey had traversed the North and South Pacific, and her Ward boilers had been subjected to all the tests of cruising conditions. The performance of these boilers was highly satisfactory, but observation and experience showed that for cruisers and battleships it would be necessary to have water tube boilers of a type which could be more easily repaired and which would stand more severe work. The experience with the Monterey gave a decided impetus to the introduction of the water tube boiler in all navies.

INDEPENDENT ACTION JUSTIFIED.

About this time it became apparent to the maritime world that the United States was to enter the race for naval strength. Engine and ship builders, gun and armor manufacturers, as well as boiler makers, gave increased consideration to the needs of the Navy.

This was the period (about 1892) when many conservative people believed that we should implicitly follow British practice in all naval affairs. Fortunately for the Nation, Admiral Melville stood like a rock against the introduction of the light machinery that was being placed in English war vessels, although urged to adopt it by practically every other official at the Navy Department. Then was the time also when he was urged to introduce the Belleville boilers. To have followed this course would have resulted as disastrously as the installation of light weight machinery. His rejection of the design was based on theoretic grounds, and this objection has since been confirmed by practical experience in the case of the English Navy, as well as in the ships of the mercantile marine.

The responsibility of giving a better boiler than the Belleville to the American Navy then rested with the Engineer-in-Chief. There were patriotic reasons why a steam generator of American design should be adopted, and there were professional and military advantages in developing a type that was familiar to the boiler makers and mechanics of our land. The Belleville had been selected as the approved type by the French Government because its manipulation was known to thousands on shore. With such a boiler the training of firemen for the Navy could in part be carried on ashore.

There were many excellent water tube boilers used on shore, but the designers of these boilers had not to take into consideration the question of securing fresh water for them, nor were they often limited as to height, floor space or weight. The Navy requirements in regard to height and weight were particularly difficult to secure, and for a time it looked as if success was far distant.

Extended tests were made of various types of boilers, and experts from the Navy Department were sent to various parts of the country to secure additional data and information. By indomitable will, Admiral Melville installed in the gunboats Marietta and Annapolis straight tube boilers of the distinct American type, which had been successfully used throughout the country in stationary installations. It is needless to say, however, that, while retaining the essential features of this type, he insisted upon many of the details being changed to adapt them to Navy purposes. One of the ships was built on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific Coast, and therefore an excellent opportunity was provided for testing the workmanship as well as the design of the boilers.

ADVANTAGES OF AMERICAN DESIGN.

The installation of the characteristic American boiler being a distinct success in vessels of the gunboat type, Admiral Melville made preparation for installing it in the medium sized cruisers. Still proceeding with extreme conservatism, he designed the steam generators of the Chicago to be a combination of the Scotch and water tube types. Seamless steel tubes of extra heavy gauge were demanded of the contractors, for experience had taught the Engineer-in-Chief of the lack of economy in trying to save weight in that direction. The Chicago's boilers are even more successful than the Marietta's, but as they are a development of the gunboat class their superiority should not be a surprise. The same combination of Scotch and American water tube types placed in the Chicago was installed in the Atlanta, and excellent reports are coming from that vessel.

During this progression extended tests have been made of boilers of the same pattern installed in vessels of the merchant marine. Admiral Melville has sought everywhere for data, and he is now convinced that he has found the type of boiler that should be approved for the large cruisers and battleships of the American Navy. In the adopted boiler he is convinced that he has found a superior to the Belleville. No series of disasters marks its introduction into our service. He has favored this type because of simplicity of design. The parts requiring renewal are principally straight tubes, and these can be procured in any part of the world. The repairs can easily be made by the ship's crew. The parts subjected to pressure are entirely of wrought metal.

Experience has shown that they possess a great military advantage, due to the rapidity with which they can be constructed. During the Spanish-American War it became necessary to utilize the light draught gunboats, and in less than two months from the time the order was given the old cylindrical boilers of these vessels had been cut out, new water tube boilers had been installed and tested and the vessels were ready for service.

The United States is therefore about to solve the boiler question, and in securing a type of American design the Navy is adopting one that can be relied upon in time of emergency, for if war should come there would be thousands from shore who would understand its manipulation after a brief period of training.

Noting the success of the type approved by Engineer-in-Chief Melville, the British Admiralty has ordered for one of its own large armored cruisers boilers of the same pattern. This is a great triumph for America, for every student of naval affairs realizes how reluctantly the naval architects and marine engineers of Great Britain are to follow American practice, since they are apprehensive that such action may be detrimental to the prestige and interests of their own great shipbuilding firms.

With the thoroughness that characterizes the scientific attainments of the Germans, the Admiralty Office at Berlin has been investigating the boiler question for its navy. Recently there appeared in the leading German marine periodical, "Schiffbau," a semi-official article which summarizes the results of tests conducted at the Imperial Experimental Station at Charlottenburg. This summary says "the preference for the Belleville boiler in England has not at all been justified from the experience had with it." In speaking of the tests made with the typical United States naval boiler the summary says: "Furthermore, it may be reasonably supposed that this system will adapt itself steadily to the constantly varying and progressive requirements of the naval service, because the boiler is composed of simple parts." As the relative tests were made at the Imperial Experimental Station, it is reasonable to presume that the German navy will decide on the type developed and approved by Rear-Admiral Melville for installation in our service.

PRESBYTERIAN REVISION COMMITTEE.

IT WILL PROBABLY FIND ITS TASK AN EXTREMELY DIFFICULT ONE.

An important event in the religious world was the meeting on December 4 in Washington of the committee of the Presbyterian General Assembly to consider recommendations from the various Presbyteries for the revision of the Westminster Confession of Faith. The committee was composed of the following members: The Rev. Drs. Charles A. Dickey, of Philadelphia; Herrick Johnson, Chicago; Samuel J. Nicholls, St. Louis; Daniel W. Fischer, Hanover College, Indiana; William McKibben, Cincinnati; George B. Stewart, Auburn, N. Y.; Stephen W. Dana, Philadelphia; Samuel P. Sprecher, Cleveland, and Henry van Dyke, Princeton University; ex-President Benjamin Harrison, Associate Justice John M. Harlan, of the United States Supreme Court; Daniel R. Noyes, of St. Paul; E. W. C. Humphrey, Louisville; William R. Crabbe, Des Moines; John E. Parsons, New-York, and Elisha A. Fraser, Detroit. Dr. William H. Roberts was secretary of the committee.

The returns of the votes of the Presbyteries as presented to this committee indicated—

First—That there is no wish to abandon the Westminster Confession, since only fifteen out of 232 Presbyteries desire a substitute creed.

Second—That a large number, 124 others out of 232, desire some supplementary or explanatory statement of certain doctrines.

Third—That a large number desire no action or a dismissal of the whole subject, 93 out of 232 being included in this category.

Fourth—That the movement for revision has come chiefly from ministers, and not from elders or members of the churches.

Those who are best qualified to form a judgment do not believe that the committee will be able to formulate a statement which will receive the requisite two-thirds vote of the General Assembly next May, in which case the Westminster Confession will continue to be binding on the Church.

CONNECTICUT TOPICS.

MANY NEW TROLLEY LINES PROJECTED.

FEW CHANGES IN THE CLERICAL FORCE AT THE CAPITOL—PUBLIC RECORDS POORLY PRESERVED.

Hartford, Conn., Dec. 22 (Special).—As the time for convening the Legislature draws near the publication of proposed applications for new street railway charters increases. Some of the proposed lines will parallel steam roads and will be fought by them. Others are parallel to street railway lines already in existence. An instance of the latter class is the application of West Hartford capitalists for a charter to build a line having this city and West Hartford for its terminals. If the charter should be granted it would aid a long delayed land speculation in the south part of West Hartford and would parallel a long section of the old line within the city. Another line proposed is through Bloomfield, Tariffville and Simsbury, to connect with the present line. This would open up a section entirely new to the trolley, and, although not largely inhabited, might bring a fair return to a well managed line, especially in carrying freight. The Enfield and Longmeadow project is again to come before the Legislature, although there is already a good line between the two places, and the much talked of and really needed connecting link of something over four miles between South Windsor and Warehouse Point, which would complete the line between this city and Springfield, is under consideration by a new company, the charter of the old company having expired by limitation. A line is proposed from Bristol to Waterbury, another line from Plainville to this city over a new route, and a line is contemplated from Derby to Cheshire, with other connections.

The report of the Commission to investigate the condition of public records in the State, of which the Rev. Dr. Samuel Hart, of Middletown, is chairman, makes public what has been known to persons familiar with such records the fact that they are kept in a most lamentable condition, without uniformity and often without any protection from fire. In the investigation of the records of town clerks it was found that many towns do not have sufficient safe room for the accommodation of documents or record books. Records were found stored away in boxes, in sheds and in barns, and some town clerks keep the record book in current use in their own homes, where there is absolutely no protection from fire. The condition of the probate records is even worse. An archives department, to be established in the State Capitol building, is suggested as a general depository of records that may have passed into the "ancient" category, and a record commission is suggested as a permanent feature of the State government.

The changes in the clerical force at the Capitol consequent upon the new administration will be few. Adjutant-General Cole has appointed Colonel Lauders his assistant, and he will begin his seventh year as the chief clerk of the department. Colonel Francis Parsons, who has been Assistant Quartermaster-General for the last two years, will not remain longer in the office, being retired at his own request, his business interests requiring his attention. It is probable that he will be succeeded by Colonel Henry C. Morgan, who has held the place at intervals for many years. Chief Clerk Mitchell of the Secretary of State's office will remain, and there are only a few minor changes to be made in the building. Governor-elect McLean has appointed Executive Messenger Rood to serve again. He has been the messenger for all the Governors since the building of the present Capitol and is a fixture no one in the State would like to see disturbed. His duties are not clearly defined by the title of the office, as he really is the keeper of the records of the Governor's office. One of the most popular appointments by the Governor-elect is that of John Trumbull Robinson to be his executive secretary. Mr. Robinson is a young lawyer of this city and a graduate of Yale.

The death of John Addison Porter caused wide regret in this city, which was his home before he accepted the secretaryship to the President. Mr. Porter had many friends in the city, and politically he had the support of its delegations on two occasions when he was a candidate for the Republican nomination for Governor.

The military surgeons of the State met in this city on Wednesday and took steps toward the formation of an organization. It was voted to apply to the Legislature for a charter, and a committee on constitution and other details of organization was appointed. Surgeon-General Calef and Dr. John B. McCook were appointed a committee to take into consideration the formation of a hospital corps.

A dedication in the eastern part of Tolland County on Wednesday was of more than ordinary interest. Mrs. William H. Yeomans presented to the town of Columbia a public hall, erected on the green near the church, to be used for all purposes to which such a hall is adapted. It is intended as a memorial to her husband's family, which has been prominent in the affairs of the town for the last fifty years.

JOHN TRUMBULL ROBINSON.
Executive Secretary to Governor McLean of Connecticut.

THE FOND DU LAC CEREMONY.

THE BISHOPS UPHELD BY A STUDENT OF THE PRAYER BOOK AND ITS RUBRICS.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: "A New-York Churchman," under date of December 13, criticises in your columns the recent episcopal consecration at Fond du Lac, when Bishop Weller was set apart as the coadjutor of Bishop Grafton, the venerable occupant of that see. The critic aforesaid is possessed of just that little amount of knowledge which makes him dangerous to the cause he represents—that of the extreme Protestant party, in what is conventionally styled the Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

Passing over all his obiter dicta as to the suitability of the "Anglo-Saxon face" to the vestments to which he objects, and his assumption that "there are not seven more bishops of the American Episcopate who would lend themselves to such a service," let me traverse what may be considered the important arguments (if arguments they can be called) which he addresses against it. First of all, he accuses Bishop Grafton and his six brethren in the episcopate of lawlessness in going against the mandatory "commission of the Presiding Bishop as representing the Church in America." But the Presiding Bishop no more represents the Church in America than any other bishop of the Church. He is only primus inter pares, and as such is vested with a modified primatial authority, in virtue of which he, in the name of the Church, is intrusted with a certain amount of jurisdiction in matters which concern merely what I may call her temporal as opposed to her spiritual life. That is, he is ex officio to the Church what the Vice-President of the United States is to the Senate—merely the presiding officer in the House of Bishops when the General Convention is in session, and is, further, the fount of jurisdiction which assigns a certain number of bishops in the Church as consecrators of any new bishop, in whose election he has no more voice than those consecrators. As to dictating what ceremonial is to be observed in any diocese outside of his own, or outside of that laid down by the Book of Common Prayer, or defining what is of faith theologically—these being matters which concern the spiritual life of the Church—he has no rights whatsoever. Even if a bishop wilfully teaches heresy, or indulges in what may seem to some idolatrous or superstitious ceremonial, or if he falls short of observing that prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, the presiding bishop has no authority to proceed against him of his own motion. All he can do as Presiding Bishop is, if he is called upon to do so, to issue a commission to examine into the alleged charges, and then, if they seem to that commission to demand such a course, he may take the necessary steps to have the offender tried, not before himself, but by a commission granted to his peers.

In the Fond du Lac case the Presiding Bishop evidently does not see any cause for proceeding against the seven bishops who took part in the consecration, and has contented himself with publicly announcing in the columns of the Church press that the commission to consecrate Dr. Weller was issued on the understanding that the service used should comprehend all that was prescribed in the "Form for Ordaining or Consecrating a Bishop," as printed in the Book of Common Prayer. That form was followed in its integrity by Bishop Grafton and the other bishops who took part in the consecration. Not one jot or tittle was omitted, and all that the rubrics demanded was obeyed to the letter. So far, therefore, the accusation of lawlessness falls to the ground.

It is a matter of complaint, however, that there were unauthorized additions made to the service in the way of ceremonies not laid down in the Book of Common Prayer. But until the bishops of the Church and the clerical and lay delegates to the General Convention—the lawmaking body of the Church—declare officially, first, that omission is prohibition, and, second, that only in the Presiding Bishop, and not the bishop of each diocese, lies the power to authorize the use of certain services and ceremonies in the various churches of the diocese, it follows that each bishop may, when he sees fit, or the need arises, prescribe the use of unaccustomed rites and services—always, of course, provided that for the ordinary public services of the Church the order of the Book of Common Prayer and its rubrics be strictly adhered to.

"A New-York Churchman's" wrath is evidently chiefly stirred up by the use of vestments, etc., such as the bishops of other Catholic communions wear. He swears by the "magpie" costume as the "episcopal habit" prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer! I have all my life been a very close student of the rubrics of that book and the canons of the Church of England, and have yet to discover that the words "rochet" and the "rest of the episcopal habit" refer to what was originally only the outdoor dress of our bishops. Copes are of action in the archbishop when crowning the king or queen—the latter also wearing one—upon the high court prelates when officiating in the chapels royal at certain functions, and on all bishops, deans and the celebrants at the Holy Communion in cathedral churches and Westminster Abbey. That all Anglican bishops use the mitre on their letter paper and envelopes, on the panels of their carriages, on their seals and on plate; that their effigies after death carry it on their heads, and that the Bishop of London, many colonial bishops of the Church of England, and, I think, the majority of the Scottish bishops, wear the mitre during ecclesiastical functions, prove not only that they are logically right, but also that they have the law on their side, if they choose to revive its use. Many of them also wear the pectoral cross, and even some Low Church bishops are not averse to being presented with a pastoral staff or an episcopal ring. None of these things are prohibited in the Prayer Book any more than the "magpie" costume is prescribed as the one style of vesting to be worn by a bishop in church. E. R.

New-York, Dec. 15, 1900.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND FOLLOWED.

THE AMERICAN PRAYER BOOK SO DIRECTS.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Will you allow me to answer the letter of "A New-York Churchman" on the recent consecration of the Bishop Coadjutor of Fond du Lac, Wis., which appears in your paper of December 14? I have no doubt he is an intelligent churchman, as he says he is, but he is not a well informed churchman, or he never would have written that letter.

In "The Form of Ordaining or Consecrating a Bishop" the bishop-elect is required to be "vested with his rochet" when he is presented to the Presiding Bishop for consecration. After the Presiding Bishop has examined him, the bishop-elect is required to "put on the rest of the episcopal habit." The rubric which so directs him does not say what that habit is. The American Prayer Book nowhere says what vestments any of the ministers shall wear in the services of the Church. It was not necessary to do so because the statement had been made in the preface of the book that "this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline or worship, or further than local circumstances require." This fundamental statement refers us to the use of the Church of England for our direction in such matters. When we turn to the English Prayer Book to find what is the episcopal habit authorized in the Church of England we find this rubric at the beginning of Morning Prayer: "Here it is to be noted that such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth." The first Prayer Book of Edward VI, which went into use June 9, 1549, and which is easily obtained, gives a clear idea of what was the use of that time. At the end of that book are "certain notes for the more plain explication and decent ministration of things contained in this book." Among them is this direction about the episcopal habit: "Whensoever the bishop shall celebrate the Holy Communion in the church or execute any other public ministration he shall have upon him, beside his rochette, a surplice or albe and a cope or vestment, and also his pastoral staff in his hand or else borne or holden by his chaplain." We know from other sources that the mitre was also worn.

This is what is meant by "the rest of the episcopal habit." Whether we like copes and mitres or not, the bishops at Fond du Lac have the law all on their side, and every well informed man knows it. All that can be said for the "rochet and chimere and scarf, sleeves and ruffles and all," is that custom has given sanction to their use, but they are not according to the plainly written directions of the Church.

If my brother churchman from New-York could bring himself to look this matter up with an unbiassed mind, he would find that that "class of minds which are capable of arguing" as I have done are not so dishonest as he thinks.

New-Haven, Conn., Dec. 16, 1900. G. H. S.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE REVISION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH CREED.

(From Harper's Weekly, by permission.)

J. E. PARSONS. THE REV. DR. G. B. STEWART. THE REV. DR. W. M'KIBBEN. THE REV. E. A. FRASER. D. R. NOYES. E. W. C. HUMPHREY. DR. W. H. ROBERTS. W. R. CRABBE, P. D.

THE REV. DR. D. W. FISCHER. THE REV. DR. S. P. SPRECHER. JUSTICE HARLAN. THE REV. S. J. NICHOLLS. THE REV. DR. HENRY VAN DYKE. EX-PRESIDENT HARRISON.

THE ORATOR AND THE VOTES.

HISTORICAL EXAMPLES TO SHOW THAT PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES INJURE THEIR CHANCES BY SPEECH-MAKING.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Now that the smoke of the last campaign has cleared away, and the bronchial tubes at least of its orators are enjoying a rest from prolonged overstrain, the question naturally arises as to whether a candidate's chance of election is more likely to be promoted than thwarted, if not undone, by the average campaign orator, particularly when that orator is the candidate himself. Have the Patrick Henrys or the George Washingtons come off oftenest as winners of the race? "Washington spake little," wrote a delegate from a Continental convention. "In action he is cool, like a bishop at his prayers." When Patrick Henry "hissed through his clenched teeth," "Give me liberty or give me death!" so carried away were his hearers, we are told, that he could easily have led them into committing an act of violence; and had a nomination been pending for a leader of "the rebels" Patrick Henry would have been chosen, without question.

Impassioned eloquence—the gift of speaking extempore, and that with the power that sways and thrills—is by many thought to be the indispensable qualification for any high office in the gift of the people, not excepting that of President of the United States. Of Henry Clay, at the outset of his career as a lawyer, says his biographer, Carl Schurz: "His success in saving murderers from the gallows did not benefit the tone and character of Kentucky society." "Henry Clay," wrote a contemporary when Clay was a candidate for the Presidency, "can get more men to run after him to hear him speak and fewer to vote for him than any other man in the United States." Political careers beginning in brilliant oratory have ended so often, like Henry Clay's, in defeat that the fervid orator is less desirable as a Presidential candidate than he was forty years ago. "No political orator," says Dr. McClure, "has ever succeeded in reaching the Presidency"—a statement fully confirmed by the list of defeated candidates—a list including Daniel Webster (defeated in getting a nomination even), John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, Stephen A. Douglas, William H. Seward, James G. Blaine, Roscoe Conkling and many lesser lights. Clearly, the reticent man, the guarded in speech, the non-committal, even the colorless candidate, like Franklin Pierce, has a far better chance for election than the impassioned orator. And how often the defeated candidate may trace his defeat directly to some daring flight of his eloquence—to the most memorable speech of his public life!

Old General Jackson was fortunate, it is said, in his inability to speak at all when thoroughly aroused, for then he was sure to choke so seriously that further utterance was impossible.

Lincoln in his great debate with Stephen A. Douglas was thought by many to make a poor showing in expression, so homely did his calm, philosophic reasoning appear in opposition to the fiery thunderbolts hurled by the "Little Giant." But Lincoln was elected for the Presidency and Douglas was not. Fremont, if he did not figure as an orator himself, became the inspiration of a flood of eloquence, so romantic had been his career; but the apathetic Buchanan came out ahead, nevertheless.

The Presidents of the United States almost without exception have been fully equal to any demand made upon them as public speakers. Lincoln and Garfield were exceptionally gifted in dignified and adequate expression, no matter what the occasion. "Cool as a bishop at his prayers" is applicable to the public speaking of them all, from Washington to McKinley. Many of their addresses—notably that of Lincoln at Gettysburg—are models of concise and lofty expression and of supreme exaltation of feeling.

Comparatively few of the candidates for the Presidency took the stump to promote their own candidacy; then, as a rule, it was only under press of circumstances, as in the case of old General Harrison—the oldest man who ever ran for the office—and who thought it was necessary that the people should see that he was not in his dotage, as the opposition declared, for all that he was seventy. General Harrison made very good campaign speeches, it is said, and did much for his own election; but the physical strain was more than he could bear, and he barely survived his inauguration. Lewis Cass did a good deal of speechmaking in his campaign, and General Scott a great deal more than his party desired, his loquacity demanding the check of a watchful escort; and even then he gave his opponents possibly as much aid as he gave himself. Horace Greeley, who had never been considered a great orator, surprised everybody by his genuine eloquence when he took the stump, and even General Grant proved his success as a campaign speaker when he became an advocate for the election of Garfield.

Jefferson in writing from the second Continental Convention said of Patrick Henry: "He captivated us all by his bold and splendid eloquence; but when general grievances were dropped . . . he had the good sense to perceive that his declamation had no weight at all in such an assembly of cool headed, reflecting, judicious men." Patrick Henry no doubt was a reader of Addison, and had pondered on what Addison had written of fine oratory generally: "The fluent oratory, ready to speak on any topic, is never profound, and when once his thought is cold it will seldom repay examination—it was only a skyrocket." All of which was seconded by Theodore Roosevelt when he said in this last campaign: "When we come to dealing with our social and industrial needs, remedies, rights and wrongs, a ton of oratory is not worth an ounce of hard headed, kindly common sense."

JANE MARSH PARKER.

Detroit, Dec. 18, 1900.

SUNDAY OPENING OF LIBRARIES.

MR. PUTNAM AGAINST CLOSING THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Washington, Dec. 22 (Special).—It will cost $12,000 a year to open the Library of Congress to the public on Sunday, but Senator McMillan's proposition to that end has been emphatically approved by the Senate committee having jurisdiction, and the amendment has been added to the current Legislative Appropriation bill, providing that the Library shall be kept open from 2 until 10 p. m. on Sundays. Librarian Putnam, to whom the advisability of the innovation on the score of desirability and practicability was referred, in his opinion furnished to Congress was strongly affirmative on both questions. He declares in the course of his statement:

At present the entire building is closed from 10 o'clock on Saturday evening until 9 o'clock on Monday morning. No visitor may have the enjoyment and instruction of the art treasures within it; no reader may have the recreation and instruction of the books. This is a serious deprivation. First, to the ordinary residents of Washington, whose affairs preclude their use of the Library on secular days; second, to the thousands of men and women employed in the Government service who, outside of their official hours, are studying to improve their education for more advanced work, and third, to visitors and students and investigators from a distance, who find their opportunity for the enjoyment of the building and the use of its contents prohibited on the day of the week on which they would be most attractive and most convenient.

For the maintenance of this Library and the building there is this year expended (exclusive of the copyright office and expenditures for permanent improvements) over $270,000. If the expenditure of $10,000 more would enable the Library to be open on Sunday it would add one-sixth to its present availability at an addition of but one-twenty-seventh of its cost of maintenance. Economically, therefore, it is an extravagance that this great plant should be idle, its influence for good in abeyance, during one-seventh of the year.

Such considerations have now elsewhere very generally prevailed, so that there is scarcely a municipal free library in the United States of any importance which is not now open on Sunday, in at least its reference departments, and during the hours named above. There is, so far as I know, no library which has attempted Sunday opening that has abandoned it. In every library where it has been attempted the use on Sunday is larger than during an equivalent period of any secular day, and it is a use deemed more fruitful. If the inducement to open extends even to a library that circulates books for home use, it must be still stronger in a library which, like the Library of Congress, is to the general public a library of reference merely, whose benefits cease when its doors are closed.

From the general experience, from my own personal experience in the conduct of two municipal libraries opened on Sunday, and from consideration of the particular conditions here, I am therefore strongly of the opinion that the Library of Congress should be opened on Sunday.

In conclusion Mr. Putnam gives a list of some of the more important free libraries of the United States which were kept open on Sunday as long ago as 1892, and then reported their experience as a decided success and adds:

Should the question be raised as to the character of the reference use probable on Sunday, it may be suggestive that during the last year the 364,000 volumes issued to readers in the main reading room were composed as follows: History, science, the useful arts, economics and miscellaneous literature, 90.6 per cent; fiction, 9.4 per cent. Of the 17,000 volumes issued for home use (to members of Congress and the other privileged classes), fiction, 53.4 per cent.

It is, I believe, the common experience of libraries that the reference use on Sunday is more serious even than that on weekdays, for the reason, perhaps, that the larger proportion of the readers are men.

The representative list of Sunday opening libraries includes the Boston Public, Bridgeport Public, Brooklyn Young Men's Christian Association, Carnegie Free, Chicago Public, Cincinnati Public, Cleveland Free Public, Denver Public, Detroit Public, Duluth Public, Fitchburg Public, Hartford Library Association, Los Angeles Public, Milwaukee Public, Minneapolis Public, New-Haven Public, New-York Free Circulating, New-York Young Men's Christian Association, Newark Free Public, Omaha Public, Pawtucket Free Public, Peoria Public, Providence Public, Sacramento Free Public, St. Louis Public, St. Paul Public, Salem Public, San Francisco Free, Sioux City Public, Toledo Public and Worcester Free.

NINTH REGIMENT NEWS.

Colonel Morris, 9th Regiment, has issued orders suspending drills from next Tuesday until January 7. The officers of the regiment will assemble for inspection on January 4, and after inspection will receive theoretical instruction in the colonel's quarters. Theoretical instruction for the non-commissioned officers will begin on January 11. During the last cold spell the north side of the armory was so cold that the company rooms were barely habitable, although the officers' corridor was well heated.

C. C. SHAYNE.

Reliable Furs.

ALASKA SEALSKIN
Jackets and Coats,
$200, $225, $250, $275,
$300 to $400 for the best.

TRIMMED MINK, CHINCHILLA, HUDSON BAY OR RUSSIAN SABLE,
prices according to quality.

Note.—I only sell the genuine Alaska sealskin London dressed and dyed, which I can recommend.

PERSIAN LAMB
Jackets and Coats,
$125 to $250.

BROAD TAIL & BABY LAMB
Jackets and Coats,
$300 to $500.

Trimmed with Mink, Chinchilla or Sable, prices according to quality.

HUDSON BAY SABLE,
Natural color, not blended or darkened in any way,

MUFFS,
$35, $50, $75, $100,
$150 to $250.

BOAS AND NECK PIECES
to match, with cluster of tails.

Extra Large Muffs and Boas,
all at corresponding prices.

RUSSIAN SABLE,
MUFFS.....$150 to $1,250
BOAS..... $150 to $1,500

COLLARETTES, VICTORINES AND MANTLES,
$200 to $7,750.

MINK MUFFS.....$15 to $75
BOAS AND COLLARS..$15 to $100
COLLARETTES.....$50 to $150

FUR CAPES,
MINK.....$75 to $250
SEALSKIN.....$150 to $750
ALASKA SABLE.....$75 to $200
PERSIAN LAMB.....$100 to $450

FUR-LINED CIRCULARS,
$25 to $100.

MEN'S FUR-LINED OVERCOATS,
large assortment, all sizes, lined and trimmed with genuine furs,
$75, $125, $175 up.

SLEIGH ROBES, COACHMEN'S OUTFITS,
at the lowest possible prices.

Store Open Evenings Until New Year's.

C. C. SHAYNE,
MANUFACTURING FUR MERCHANT,
42d St., bet. Broadway and Sixth Ave.

A REMARKABLE PISTOL.

From The London Globe.

The Zurich correspondent of "The Lancet" writes that at a meeting of the Zurich Medical Society on November 27 Professor Krönlein demonstrated a self-loading pistol which is creating quite a stir in army circles. A man who shot himself with this weapon was admitted to the surgical clinic with a perforated skull and died soon after. The necroscopy revealed a most extraordinary power of destruction in the bullet, there being quite a network of fissures in the skull, besides the small wound of entrance and exit. The German army authorities, it is said, intend to introduce this destructive weapon into the army. The simplicity of loading is such that 120 shots can be fired in one minute. It seems a weapon admirably adapted for cavalry forces and mounted infantry.

SUCCESS.

From The Washington Star.

"Dar is all kinds an' degrees o' success," said Uncle Eben. "Wif some folks it is amassin' fortunes an' rulin' countries an' wif yuthuhs it's jes' keepin' out o' jail."