The Sun.

THURSDAY, JULY 13, 1905.

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

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	$0 50
DAILY, Per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	70

Postage to foreign countries added.

Readers who intend to leave town for the summer may have THE SUN mailed to them at the foregoing prices. The address may be changed as is desired. Order through your newsdealer or of THE SUN, 170 Nassau street.

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.

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

The Tarnished Spoon.

No man now on earth has stated the cheery philosophy of the life that is worth living, the obligations of common humanity, the graces and generosities that are needed to gild a sordid world, more frequently and unctuously than the benevolent old underwriter upon whose deeds the hundred eyes of the District Attorney's office are now supposed to be converging. His precepts are benedictions; for example:

"Keep in touch with the young. Join in their games, be a feature in the dance, romp the fastest and turn the quickest in the Virginia reel or the country dance, go up to the old college and light your pipe and sing college songs, take your children to the theater and howl with them at the roaring farce and laugh with them at the comedy and cry with them at the tragedy; be their confidant in their love affairs, and, if they are not equal to it, write their love letters, and never stop writing some for yourself. Thus will the twentieth century, with its cleaner purposes, its higher endeavors and its limitless opportunities, welcome us older fellows as the youngest and most vigorous of those who are to solve its problems and make its record."

Throughout the whole life of the excellent Dr. DEPEW he seems to have practised what he preached. He certainly kept in touch with the young Mr. HYDE. He has danced with the dancers and romped with the rompers and sung with the singers and smoked with the smokers and howled his way with the howlers into the cleaner purposes and limitless opportunities of the twentieth century. And when his fellow townsmen in Peekskill, about a dozen years ago, perpetuated his virtues and his bland and benign physiognomy in a splendid edition of gold or silver gilt souvenir spoons, with variations in the way of orange spoons, paper knives and bonbon ladles, they published to the world this estimate of his moral greatness:

"CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW—his life and character are without a parallel in this generation; the value of his thoughtful mind, the wisdom of his sense, the beauty of his speech, are the pride of the nation; and to every boy in America's common schools and to every young man in America's colleges are an inspiration to vie with each other to approach the acme of his perfections.

"Peekskill, birthplace of CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW, sends forth its Souvenir Spoon, conscious that the designer and silversmith have gracefully wrought in silver and gold a correct and exquisite likeness of her illustrious son."

The illustrious son and acme of Peekskillian perfection testified as follows before the State Superintendent of Insurance regarding the loan by himself and the other members of the Equitable's executive committee to the Depew Improvement Company of Buffalo:

"I have been, I think, unusually successful in my practise in pulling clients out of financial difficulty and administering their estates when they put them in my hands, as several of them have done, and I now have properties to the amount of a good many millions of dollars of several people who leave their properties entirely in my hands, to be administered as I see fit; and in all such things I have made money for my clients. But whenever I take a thing for myself I demonstrate that when a lawyer is his own client he has a fool for a client."

At the time of the transaction between the Equitable and the Depew Improvement Company Mr. DEPEW was special counsel for the protection of the Equitable's interests at an annual retainer of $20,000. The Equitable was his client. He was administering the estate of the Equitable's policyholders. The Depew Improvement Company, named for him, and in which he held a large stock interest, got into financial difficulties in 1901. The Insurance Department had appraised its property at $150,000. The Depew company applied to the Equitable for a loan of $250,000. Mr. DEPEW's testimony continues:

"Q. You voted in favor of this loan in the executive committee? A. I think I did, but I want to say that I didn't advise the loan, and was not consulted about it at all.

"Q. I suppose you are aware that in 1901 there was an appraisement made by the Insurance Department of that property, and their appraisal was $150,000? A. No; I didn't know about that. Didn't I write a letter——

"Q. You wrote a letter to the Insurance Department asking us to reappraise? A. Yes; but that was because the manager asked me to write the letter, on the ground that the appraisers did not understand the business and that the appraisal was ridiculously below the real value."

The reappraisal thus procured by Mr. DEPEW was $393,750. The loan of $250,000 to the Depew Improvement Company was made, Mr. DEPEW voting for the loan as a member of the executive committee of the Equitable directors. At the same time, as a promoter of the land development scheme of the Depew Improvement Company, he contracted to guarantee the Equitable against the loss of the money loaned to the Depew Improvement Company. The Depew company failed, the Equitable's mortgage was foreclosed, and the property on which $250,000 had been loaned fetched $50,000. With the accrued interest the loss to the policyholders whose interests Mr. DEPEW has been paid $20,000 a year for sixteen years to protect was about $225,000.

But there remained his contract or guarantee to save the Equitable from loss. Concerning this feature of the transaction his own testimony is somewhat vague:

"I will say right here that when the guarantors signed the guarantee the managers said that no money would ever be required of us, because they had parties that were going to buy the property and take it off our hands.

"Q. As a lawyer, do you think that this paper fixes any liability on you of any kind? A. As a lawyer, I don't think so, and I am informed by the counsel of the receiver that it does not."

But the practical repudiation of the good Dr. DEPEW's guarantee is described in somewhat plainer terms in the testimony of Mr. G. R. BROWN, the superintendent of the Equitable's bond and mortgage department:

"Q. Have you personally spoken to Mr. WEBB or Mr. DEPEW and suggested that they were personally responsible for the performance of this agreement and liable to the Equitable society for loss? A. I personally have not seen Mr. WEBB. I have spoken to Mr. DEPEW, because it was at his request that I examined the property a year ago.

"Q. What did you say to him on that subject? A. At that time he led me to believe that he was going to see the Equitable through without any loss.

"Q. What did he say in substance? A. He said in substance that he had been dragged into this matter by WALTER WEBB—who is now deceased—I believe, a brother of Dr. SEWARD WEBB; that the place had been named after him without his consent, and that he had sunk $125,000 to $150,000 of his own money in it, which he was willing to lose if necessary, or put in more to help the Equitable out and get it out without loss.

"Q. Did he say in substance that he would save the Equitable harmless for the delay? A. Yes, he did.

"Q. That promise on his part has never been reduced to writing, except so far as it appears in this exhibit? A. No, sir.

"Q. And I suppose that you understood a personal promise of the sort was not legally binding, didn't you? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Do you know if Mr. DEPEW made the same statement to any other person in your presence? A. He made the statement to the comptroller of the society in my presence.

"Q. To Mr. JORDAN? A. Yes, sir."

We have spoken of the Peekskill spoons in their pristine brightness. If you possess one of these spoons or ladles, with its correct and exquisite likeness of the Hon. CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW, lock it up, for heaven's sake!

Better yet, have it melted down into plain bullion without loss of time, lest some boy in the common schools of America or some young man in the colleges of America shall see it and be inspired to emulation.

Mr. Bristow's Panama Report.

No doubt the bosom of the Hon. J. L. BRISTOW swelled with pride as he read Secretary TAFT's encomium on his recent Panama Railway report. We shall offer no objection to the encomium. As a report the Bristow production is doubtless admirable. But we are not in full accord with all of the Hon. J. L. BRISTOW's conclusions.

His proposal that the transisthmian railway be put in proper railway order and run as a road should be is right and reasonable. It can be made a very useful adjunct in the construction of the canal. Its due efficiency is no more than a reasonable business proposition. In his fifth recommendation we strike a snag. He proposes the opening of the ports of Colon and Panama to the use of "all steamship lines on equal terms." As these are the principal seaports of a foreign country it is not altogether clear that Mr. BRISTOW's recommendation comes entirely within the scope of American legislation. The end might be reached perhaps through a diplomatic request submitted to the authorities of the Republic of Panama.

Recommendations No. 6 and No. 7 are a little peculiar. They provide, in effect, that if there is not enough business in steamship transportation on either side of the Isthmus to induce private capital to run steamship lines the United States shall go into the business of ocean transportation and run steamers in connection with the railroad. As a matter of commercial politics it probably makes no difference whether the Government carries freight and passengers at fixed tariff rates in cars or in cabins. But the acquisition of the Panama Railway by the Government has its special justification. This does not seem to us quite the same thing as the ownership and operation of steamship lines from domestic to foreign ports. If we are to run a line from New York or New Orleans to Colon and a line from San Francisco to Panama why should we not run similar lines to other foreign ports where there is not business enough to attract private capital?

Has not the Hon. J. L. BRISTOW another recommendation coming? Is the bunch which he submits quite worth the $10,000 paid for them?

What Has China to Do With the Peace Negotiations?

According to a telegram from Paris, China has addressed a note to the French Government similar to the notes previously presented to the Japanese and Russian Foreign Offices, expressing a desire to take part in the peace conference about to be held at Portsmouth. We have been informed unofficially that the proposal was received with some favor at St. Petersburg, but firmly repelled at Tokio. Under the circumstances, it may be significant that the third Power approached should have been Russia's ally. The move looks like an attempt to divert the sympathy of neutral nations from the Japanese on the plea that China ought to be consulted as to the disposition of her territory.

The plea is a specious one, but it will not bear close examination. In the fate of Corea the Pekin Government is not concerned, except as a treaty Power having commercial relations with the Peninsula Kingdom. Her old claim to suzerainty was formally renounced by the Treaty of Shimonoseki. Undoubtedly, China has a right to demand the restoration of her authority throughout the whole of Chinese Manchuria. Even Russia, although she failed to carry out her promise to evacuate that region in 1903, never asserted any right to exercise sovereignty in it, but, on the contrary, repeatedly disclaimed any intention of doing so. Japan, on her side, both before and since the outbreak of the war, has disavowed any purpose of securing territorial aggrandizement at China's expense, and has, indeed, based her claim to the goodwill of neutral Powers on the limitation of her object to the expulsion of the Russians from Manchuria. Both belligerents, therefore, are estopped from opposing the restitution of Chinese sovereignty throughout the three Manchurian provinces.

Sovereignty, however, is one thing; the right accruing under a lease or franchise is another. It is well known that the Russian Government obtained from China a twenty-five year lease of the tip of the Liaotung peninsula, the section including Port Arthur and Dalny, and that a Russian private corporation acquired a franchise authorizing it to build and operate the Manchurian branches of the Siberian Railway. Can this lease and this franchise be treated as assets, transferable by conquest or voluntary assignment? The Pekin Government says: No; such assets are not transferable, because the grantor of a lease or franchise may have reserved equities that would be sacrificed by a transfer. It is doubtless true that a nation, conscious of weakness or desirous of isolation, might make concessions to one Power which it would withhold from another. Chinese sovereigns permitted the relatively feeble Portuguese to retain a foothold at Macao after the subjects of more powerful European States had been expelled from the Middle Kingdom. Japan herself, for a generation, made a similar exception in favor of Holland's unimportant trading post at Nagasaki. It is at least conceivable that the Pekin Government might object to Japan as a tenant of Port Arthur, or as an assignee of the Manchurian railways. Plausible, consequently, are the grounds on which China requests to be heard at a peace conference the decisions of which may sensibly affect her interests.

It is natural, on the other hand, that Japan should insist upon conducting the negotiations for peace directly and exclusively with her opponent. The participation of China might lead to vexatious complications and interminable delay. The preliminary question would at once arise: Shall China's assent be essential to the formulation of terms of peace; or may it be passed over, in the event of an agreement between the belligerents? Japan could hardly be expected to recognize China's assent as indispensable; while, if it might be treated as negligible, China could not, with any show of dignity, take part in the Portsmouth conference. It is plain enough that if the negotiations are to have any prompt and definite result the two belligerents should be left to come to an agreement without intermeddling on the part of any other Power. Indisputably, the disposition to be made of Port Arthur and Dalny and of the Manchurian railways is a matter of interest to China, but the possible modification of the arrangements made at Portsmouth may properly be deferred until after peace has been concluded between Russia and Japan. Then representatives of the Mikado and the Chinese Emperor should be able to agree on the conditions upon which China would ratify the transfer of leases and franchises in Manchuria.

The fact that China's request to participate in the peace negotiations was viewed with less disapprobation at St. Petersburg than at Tokio is at least suggestive. The late LI HUNG CHANG might have set just such a trap. Japan will not fall into it, however. The Mikado's advisers will not repeat the mistake that events compelled them to make in 1895. They are not likely to tolerate on China's part an interference which they would not brook a second time at the hands of Germany and France.

The Pay of Government Servants.

The correspondent who suggests, in a letter which we print to-day, that a convention of the people be called "for the express purpose of demanding a return to the 'simple life' on the part of their Representatives or public servants at the seat of the Federal Government," exaggerates the condition of profuse expenditure which he would prevent.

Washington, as a whole, so far as concerns the vast mass of the Federal officials, already exemplifies the "simple life" more than any other of the great towns of America. From highest to lowest, all except comparatively very few of them live without ostentation. They are compelled to economy of expenditure by official salaries small relatively to the incomes of rich men. Mr. ROOSEVELT said at Asbury Park that every member of his Cabinet could make more than his official salary if he went in for money making in private life; and probably all of them have additional private fortunes which enable them to live handsomely. But that is a mere accident; and, generally, the state kept up by these Cabinet officers is not great. They live modestly enough. The number of men in Congress who can afford large expenditures is small. The vast majority of them live frugally on their official salaries wholly. During the sessions of Congress they are scattered in hotels and boarding houses at which they pay very moderate prices. In all the subordinate places in the departments, even those in which great abilities are required, the salaries are small, and all except very few of the officeholders are compelled to live with the economy such narrow incomes impose.

Our friend instances the large expenditures of Mr. WHITELAW REID at London as an illustration of the profuseness he would prevent. He would have it "possible for a man of moderate means" to succeed Mr. REID as Ambassador; but actually it is already possible. Ambassador CHOATE got along famously in London without attempting to keep up such a display. Mr. JOHN HAY, who preceded Mr. CHOATE as Ambassador, was a rich man, but we heard little about his manner of life in London. When Mr. BAYARD was at London he made and was able to make no great social display. Mr. PHELPS was not rich enough to keep up a high state socially, nor was Mr. LOWELL; yet all of these lent distinction to the office and received the distinguished consideration of English society. However moderate the means of a man, it is possible for him to sustain the dignity of the Ambassadorship to the Court of St. James's; yet the American people for their own dignity ought to provide suitable residences for their Ambassadors and Ministers at every European capital, and they ought to give these representatives of their power salaries which comport with the importance of the offices.

The salaries of officials of the United States Government have been increased several times since its foundation, and necessarily, for the relative value of money has declined. For instance, in 1789 the salaries of Senators and Representatives were fixed at $6 a day and $6 for every twenty miles of travel. In 1795 these sums were increased to $7 each. In 1816 the salary was made $1,500 per annum. In 1818 it was raised to $8 a day and $8 for every twenty miles of travel. In 1856 the pay was put at $3,000 and mileage as before, and in 1866 the salary was raised to $5,000 and of the Speaker to $8,000, as these are now. The salary grab act of 1873, which increased the pay to $7,500 for Senators and Representatives, aroused an indignant protest, not because of the increase in itself, but because the raise was made retroactive only in the case of Congress, and that feature was concealed under a raise of the salary of the President from $25,000 to $50,000 a year, of the Chief Justice from $8,500 to $10,500, and of the Vice-President, Cabinet officers and Associate Justices from $8,000 to $10,000, none of them retroactive. This salary grab act was repealed the next year, and all the salaries except those of the President and Justices reverted to the old standard.

These salaries should be now increased moderately, and the bill for that purpose introduced into the last Congress ought to be passed; but no increase which would justify extravagant expenditures commensurate with those of many very rich men is suggested, nor would it be defensible.

So far from profuseness of expenditure by a public officer being necessary for him to maintain the dignity of his place, it rather works to his disadvantage in this Republic. The man in office who lives on his official salary, modestly and simply, gains a better reputation with the American people than the man who surrounds himself with costly luxuries. But the proposed, and requisite, increase in salaries permits of no such profuseness and is only commensurate with the more expensive standard of living since the old days.

Caring for Prisoners.

Comptroller GROUT's announcement that the Finance Department will audit and pay bills incurred by the police for feeding prisoners should be, and of course will be, the signal for the end of the practise under which needy persons caught by the law have been obliged to depend on the charity of individuals for their meals while awaiting arraignment. The inhumanity of locking men and women up for almost twenty-four hours without feeding them is manifest, and the injustice of calling on policemen to sacrifice part of their pay to repair the city's negligence is apparent.

Unfortunately it cannot be said that in this particular alone the city has treated persons under arrest unjustly. No one who is familiar with the prison rooms and cells of the police stations in the city needs to be told that they are a discredit to the community. Many of them positively menace the health not alone of the persons confined in them but of the neighbors; and, except in the most modern stations, they are badly designed, poorly ventilated and impossible to keep clean. A police station prisoner is subjected to "cruel and unusual punishments" merely by being placed in the cells. Were the State to keep its convicts in such cells as the city provides for mere suspects, who are as likely to be innocent of crime as they are to be guilty, there would be indignation meetings from Montauk Point to Buffalo within twenty-four hours.

When Magistrates discharge prisoners with a reprimand, the verbal rebukes they utter sometimes seem inadequate. If the prisoners have been locked up overnight in a police station, however, they have not escaped lightly, and this is a fact that Magistrates take into consideration. The city will do only a part of its duty by feeding its prisoners. The conditions under which they are held ought to be reformed promptly from top to bottom.

The number of members of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks in attendance in Buffalo on Tuesday has been estimated as between 20,000 and 30,000. This fraternal order, established in 1868, has 200,000 members, and the attendance of as many as 20,000 at the Buffalo convention is an evidence of interest as well as of the stability of membership.

The Eagles, a similar fraternal order, but not a rival of the Elks, was established in 1898 and has a claimed membership of 150,000. The Knights of Columbus, founded in 1882, who had their national convention very recently at Los Angeles, have 135,000 members, of whom, according to the records, 88,000 are "social" and 47,000 "insured" members.

While the fraternal organizations of the country, those depending on the good fellowship, sociability and comradeship of their members, are, in Western phrase, booming, it would appear that organizations of a provident or protective character, which appeal for membership on the ground of financial benefits which come to their members by insurance funds or sick benefits, are compelled to make concessions of rates and charges, as has been seen in several notable cases this summer.

By many members or intending members of social organizations the view appears to be held that "insurance" is a plain business proposition, to be handled most effectively by companies officially chartered for that purpose. Fraternity is one thing; insurance is another.

Did the Attorney-General of the State of New York loan his copy of the Equitable testimony on Sunday?

It was a lucky day for Canada when, mainly through the efforts of the late WILLIAM MCDOUGALL, the vast area of territory belonging to the Hudson Bay Company was added to the Dominion at an expense of only $1,500,000. To-day that territory has a population of 800,000. Its agricultural and other products this year are officially valued at more than $100,000,000, or over sixty-five times its original cost. The Dominion Government is now urged to grant a pension to Mr. MCDOUGALL's family.

The Depew Improvement Company! There seems to have been room for it.

THE SUBMARINE BOAT.

An Argument That Its Use Ought to Be Prohibited by Civilization.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Serious efforts for a world peace all seem to be directed to the main question of war as a whole, and the event seems to prove that the world is as yet no more ready for this change than for many other reforms, stillborn before their time. Meantime, are not the really unnecessary "horrors of war" increasing in detail, and with little or no serious effort to abate them, when much might be accomplished by turning the growing sentiment for peaceful methods in a more practical direction for which the times may be ripe? Must neutral life and shipping continue to be exposed to the hazards of the uncontrolled or derelict floating mine? Can we not eliminate this pirate, one may call it, in the same manner that civilization has by agreement destroyed other piracy, proscribed the privateer and prohibited the explosive bullet, has made them barbarisms and put them in the past together with the poisoned arrow and the stinkpot?

But most serious of all, is peace, too, to be made "hell," and by such a boomerang as is the submarine boat? Moreover, will the stronger war Powers persist in discounting their own strength by continuing to accord to it a place in their warfare, and in so doing some day find a David? Dangerous as is this weapon to him who wields it, even in experiment, it is as yet of uncertain or disputed power against an enemy. It merely offers another means of making a "lucky shot," and in this is unscientific and at variance with the modern principles of the profession of war, which are based less on strategy and kindred methods, and more on careful businesslike preparation and attention to organization and detail than ever before. Of course, a Power having the exclusive use of a new or unusual weapon, or discovering such during a war, or having to combat it in the hands of an enemy, would not neglect to use it; but should such a weapon pass without question into the armaments of the world? Should it not be carefully examined to see if it be worthy a place there?

In order to build up warmaking power nations draw on their wealth, their industry, their mechanical and inventive genius, and on the patriotism and spirit of their men—on all their best. These are drawn together, and by infinite pains are molded into the fleet and army—the nation's hoarded fund for the defense of national honor. Must this force be degraded by being made to try conclusions in a game of chance with the submarine—a gambler with empty pockets, with all to gain and nothing to lose? This gambler, too, so far, has nothing to its score but debts? It has not yet won a place by a single known victory in the two recent wars in which it had a fair chance, while it owes the world the lives of those men who have been suffocated at the bottom of the sea in fruitless experiments. Is not this gambling in lives as repugnant to international morals as the profession of the lawless gamester is to decent society?

An international peace or arbitration agreement, unless supported by general disarmament, can last in our day only until the prize at stake and the possession of warmaking power sufficient to win it make us forget our "national morals." But we can eliminate the submarine and save humanity and the war system the reproach and spare the victims the horrors of such grewsome deaths as those aboard the Farfadet. We can do it with the same certainty that we have eliminated the explosive bullet and treachery under a flag of truce or under false colors. We can eliminate it with the same certainty that we have provided the humane refuge of the Red Cross.

Is it less worth doing? This proposal, with the proposal further to define and prescribe permissible weapons of war, should be congenial to the President, newly distinguished in the statesmanship of peace and humanity. The Departments of State, of War and of the Navy are each and all deeply concerned in such a proposal, and it is of such importance, aside from its bearing on mere humaneness, that it should be well worth the attention not only of the Executive, but of the heads which he himself has chosen for these departments.

Without attempting to catalogue recent known disasters to submarines, I may point out that the French Farfadet gives us but one of a series of similar warnings which we have had even within the past year from the experience of several navies. In the British navy there is known to have been at least one somewhat similar accident; that one attended by a loss of life almost, if not quite, as great as in the present case. In our own navy, almost exactly one year ago, one of our submarines plunged to the bottom in the approaches to Newport, a depth of nearly two hundred feet (thirty fathoms), and was brought to the surface with the three officers and several men then aboard only by the exercise of rare skill and judgment on the part of the officer in command, combined with the fortunate circumstance that, though the mechanism of the vessel was deranged in one respect, in all other respects it stood without failure the unusual strains due to excessive depth and abnormal behavior.

NEWPORT, July 11. HENRY H. WARD.

Tribute to a Deceased Priest.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Many Americans who enjoyed his hospitality and friendship at Gibraltar and Westminster will deplore the death of the Right Reverend James Bellord, which was announced from Southend, England, by the last mail. Few Roman Catholic priests have had a wider following, and at Westminster Cathedral men of every grade gathered to pay their last tribute to their dead friend, from the pathetic group of crippled army pensioners from Chelsea, Irish, Welsh and English, to the Duke of Norfolk, head of the British Catholics, and dozens of King Edward's court.

In his varied career, the earlier part of which was spent as chaplain in the British Army, he was present through the Zulu war and was decorated for special bravery in aiding the wounded during the disastrous battle of Ulundi. He served in the first Boer war and through the whole Egyptian war of 1882. At the battle of Tel-el-Kebir he was dangerously wounded. Unable to move from the stretcher, he called three war correspondents to his side. The doctor begged him to keep still, but he pointed to the dying and insisted—and through the entire battle he was carried by the correspondents, cheering the wounded and performing the last offices to the dying soldiers. In 1890 he retired and was appointed Vicar Apostolic of Gibraltar and titular Bishop of Milevis, and he was afterward Auxiliary Bishop of Westminster.

TIMOTHY G. RUSSELL.

NEW YORK, July 10.

A Puzzled Father.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I am the father of two children who at my wife's death will receive part of the value of a house left to her by a relative, to live in or rent out during her lifetime as she sees fit. In carrying out the provisions of this relative's will, I am informed by the executor that a special guardian must be appointed to examine the bill of expenses to be submitted by him. I am further told that this special guardian must be a member of the bar.

As the house in question is free and clear of any mortgage, all taxes having been paid to date, I would thank you to inform me why I should be put to the expense of about $100 when I feel quite able to act as guardian myself and decide whether my children are being treated right or not. I might add that the worthy executor wants to name his own friend as "special guardian." JACK.

NEW YORK, July 10.

The Choice of Evils.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I agree with the sentiments expressed in yesterday's SUN by John Y. Culyer as to the intense inconvenience, not to say suffering, caused by the closing of the ventilators and windows in the trains passing through the tunnel to and from the Grand Central Station in warm weather.

I believe that the ingress of the small amount of smoke from the engines is far preferable to the parboiling the passengers now receive from the closing of the ventilators and windows, an excellent provocative of sunstroke. Let other passengers on this route speak out.

NEW YORK, July 11. FREDERICK C. LAWYER.

The Roots of Hamilton College.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In my student days at Hamilton College—1860-61—there were five Roots in the institution: Oren Root, professor of mathematics, and his three sons. Oren Root, Jr., was tutor; Walstein a member of the class of '62, and Elihu Root of the class of '64.

So much as to the family of Prof. Root. There was another, Linus B. Root, class of '64, and, as I now remember, a distant relative of the others above named. ANOTHER ALUMNUS, '64.

CORTLAND, N. Y., July 11.

Preference.

Some praise the man behind the desk,
The man behind the gun,
The man behind the this and that;
We laud them every one.

Now, none of these appeals to me;
But for a steady job
I want to be the man behind
The corn upon the cob.

MCLANDBURGH WILSON.

OFFICIAL SALARIES.

A Demand for Organized Popular Protest Against Profuseness.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your editorial to-day on "The Vulgar Talk About Money," is interesting, timely and to the point.

You say toward the close: "Undoubtedly the bill increasing official salaries within moderation ought to be passed; but not to enable servants of the people in high places to compete in luxury with the very rich men of this period. Modesty and simplicity of living comport with the theory of this democratic Republic. As it is, there is too much profuseness in Washington. Private luxury encourages public prodigality. If there is any place where the 'simple life' ought to be illustrated practically, it is at the seat of the Federal Government."

To meet a serious and latent difficulty or danger the following suggestion occurs to my mind:

So long as there are "hundreds of rich men in Washington," and the number of such among the Senators and Representatives in Congress is also rapidly increasing, the Senator or Representative of only ordinary financial ability is, on the one hand, exposed to a temptation to money getting or money-openness in order to meet an excess of expenditure, or, on the other, subjected to the painful and humiliating experience and consciousness, well nigh ever present, of inability to hold a comfortable place alongside of or in association with colleagues in much better circumstances.

Now, in view of the whirlpool of extravagance created by men of great wealth and into which men of only moderate means are at first by degrees and after a while irresistibly drawn, would not a convention of the people of the several States and irrespective of party, called for the express purpose of demanding a return to the "simple life" on the part of their Representatives or public servants at the seat of the Federal Government, with the understanding and recommendation that no one failing to comply with the wishes of the people in this respect shall be renominated for office, and that only those pledged to these views shall receive nomination or appointment, be desirable?

It will not do to say that this is wholly a matter with which others have no business whatever to interfere. Officeholders must not forget that they are not the people, that they are not independent of the people, that, in fact, they are not wholly themselves, but the people's servants. As such they must attend to business and conduct themselves not according to the standard set up by men of independent circumstances, but which the average citizen or voter sets up for him.

It may be said, the evil will cure or regulate itself. But is it doing so? The very proposition to increase official salaries within moderation is not only an admission that the tendency to extravagance is rapidly increasing, but also is due to the false standard of living to which Senators, Representatives, Cabinet officers and public servants in general are bowing. And where will it end unless a check is summarily put upon it?

If it were laid down and generally understood at home and abroad that henceforth there is to be a return to the "simple life" on the part of all public servants, it would be possible for a man of moderate means, if otherwise qualified, being successor to Mr. Reid as Ambassador to England, or successor to either of the two millionaire United States Senators from New Jersey, or successor to Mr. Root as Secretary of State. Otherwise these high posts can only be filled in the future by men capable of more than ordinary pecuniary exploitation. Then, too, will no longer be heard in connection with retirement from office the familiar excuse, "Can't afford it."

Among applicants for place the merchant accepts the person who in addition to capability has good habits. Why should the servants of the people, high or low, rich or poor, great or small, be allowed to waste their time and salaries and health by systematic excesses in social rivalries, costly entertainments, in practises and indulgences that can only hinder and not help?

Is not the remedy to be found in making at once the much needed reform, rather than in an increase of salary? Or, having made the increase, should it not be followed up with vigorous reformatory measures as herein suggested? CORRESPONDENT.

BROOKLYN, July 11.

CRITICISM OF LAWYERS.

Defended as Required and Justified by Patent Facts.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In yesterday's SUN, in his letter complaining of censure of lawyers by the press, "L." concludes: "In the circumstances, should there not be less of loose talk about their delinquencies and should not general criticism give way to specific criticism with facts as a basis?"

Mr. Dill's appointment, to which he refers, is admirable and should be praised, but is present criticism of certain types of lawyers harmful? Should it not be invited? Is it without foundation?

What of the so called shipbuilding trust underwriting, not to specify only the French phases of it? What of Senator Depew's contract with the Equitable? Of the Peter Powers? Of the proceedings *in re* Judge Hooker?

The other day a Federal court in New York disciplined a firm of Philadelphia lawyers for misconduct. "Ambulance chasers" connotes a class of lawyers; and an equally ghoulish term will doubtless be found for those who canvass the possible creditors of an alleged insolvent begging the privilege of collecting their claims gratis, nursing the fond hope of first levying tribute on the debtor's store.

Of course, the "profession of law" needs no defense, but is criticism not useful "in the circumstances" mentioned, only some of many which any reader of THE SUN can recall?

A very eminent American lawyer and teacher, for years on the bench, ultimately Chief Justice of his State, in an address to the law students of the University of Pennsylvania on legal ethics, said years ago: "A horde of pettifogging, barratrous, custom seeking, money making lawyers is one of the greatest curses with which any State or community can be visited." [Professional Ethics, by Sharswood, 1854.] Criticism, based on facts to be sure, will do much to save the community from the "horde" specified by Judge Sharswood. W. B. LINN.

PHILADELPHIA, July 10.

U. of P. Also Claims Roosevelt.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your standard is always accuracy. I therefore venture to call your attention to an important omission in the interesting article you published last Sunday concerning American presidential recipients of honorary degrees.

President Roosevelt honored the University of Pennsylvania by accepting, at the annual "University Day" exercises, held on Feb. 22 last at Philadelphia, the degree of doctor of laws, along with his Majesty the German Emperor and King of Prussia. Mr. Roosevelt is therefore entitled to the academic distinction, in addition to similar honors conferred by other institutions of learning, of being an honorary alumnus of Pennsylvania.

J. HARTLEY MERRICK, Secretary.

PROUT'S NECK, Me., July 11.

The Bier-Wein School of Poetry.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In reply to "Inquirer" in your issue of to-day, headed "Poems of Liquid Sequence," here is the German of it:

"Bier auf Wein,
Das las sein;
Aber Wein auf Bier,
Das rãht ich dir.

His friend was probably of German descent and tried his hand at translation. Don't you think the German version better advice?

WILLIAM HOHENZOLLERN.

MURRAY HILL, July 11.

The Blushing Lecturer.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your article headed "The Lecturer Blushed," in to-day's paper, reminds me of when I did the same thing about fourteen years ago, when I was a first sergeant in a military school and was instructing a drill corps of young ladies connected with the church at the corner of 128th street and Seventh avenue, New York.

I well remember that I also blushed and that there was considerable tittering among the ladies.

JERSEY CITY, July 11. H. H. SHOPP.

Stephanie to Sell Austrian Jewels.

From the London Globe.

Countess Lonyay has decided to dispose of all her jewelry and valuables associated with her first marriage to Rudolph of Austria, and the sale will take place by auction in the French capital. The collection has already been placed in the hands of a leading jeweler. It includes a veil of lace presented to her by the city of Brussels on her marriage, and showing the united arms of Belgium and Austria. There is also a beautiful parure of amethyst presented by the town of Fiume.

In the Light of To-day.

"Gadzooks," remarked the shade of Jones,
"With all this pomp and fuss,
Who would have thought that being dead
Would prove so strenuous!"

THE NEGRO, THE CHINAMAN AND THE JAPANESE.

They Must Be Kept in a Class by Themselves, Declares a Correspondent.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Booker T. Washington on Independence Day addressed an audience at Montclair, N. J., and during his speech said that he was glad that a sentiment prevailed that favored giving to the Chinese a chance to come to the United States. He said that he believed that it would from every point of view pay to give the people of China "a fair chance."

It is probably going back to somewhat ancient history to renew a discussion of the negro question of America, even though it be brought up in connection with that of the Filipino, Japanese and Chinese. But Mr. Washington's words seem to bear strong support of the theory of the Southern States that a colored man—brown, black or yellow—has ideas of government and things that are not essentially white.

The self-constituted laws of man have many times been used as a battering ram to punch holes in the impervious laws of nature, with the inevitable result that nature has always demonstrated the impossibility of defeat. No one begrudges Mr. Washington, or any other negro, his brains—and many covet them. The fact remains that it was some strange ruling of the Creator and not the "great educational system of the country" that gave to the gentleman the power of gray matter that has managed by force of individuality to predominate over the black of skin. But how many of Mr. Washington's people have shown ambition sufficient to take them out of the rut and place the gray above the black? How many of them are capable of receiving knowledge, even were it offered them?

Inadvertently in his Montclair speech Mr. Washington develops the dangerous fraternalism that exists to a greater or less extent among all races that are of other shades than white. His words were undoubtedly born of an instinct of self-preservation of a kind that nature has instilled in every human being. They were the instinctively answered "call of the wild." They come from a man who knows nothing of Chinese immigration or its evils and who simply speaks from a "colored" point of view. It is the echo of the warning that makes the "yellow peril," the "brown peril" and the "black peril."

The plain truth of the matter is, the great white race does not care to halt in its progress for the black hordes, the yellow hordes or the brown hordes to evolute a standard of mental and mechanical proficiency.

Nature put the Chinese in one class, the Japanese in another and the negro in another. The white man had his distinctive place in the great plane of development allotted long ago. Because Mr. Booker Washington happens to be a most estimable, well educated gentleman and there are a few others with a black skin like him is no reason why we should take our hats off to his race, the Chinese or any other "gentlemen of color." A study of the skulls of most of the kind of people that white persons object to reveals that it would not be possible to penetrate their brain cavities with a dose of class courses, even were these loaded and fired from a chokebore shotgun. The average Japanese is impractical as an American citizen, the negro improbable and the Chinaman impossible. As might have been expected, the education of Mr. Washington has developed several color lines, all but one of which he certainly ought to fight very shy of. J. S. TYLER.

WASHINGTON, July 11.

Notes of the British Universities.

The first British Inter-Universities Students' Congress has just been held in London, the sessions having begun on June 28 and closed on July 1. Delegates were present from the leading universities of the United Kingdom, and the topics discussed included the question of establishing a system of "mutual recognition," whereby work done at any university may count toward a degree at any other; the position of women in universities; the value of degrees in a combined arts and sciences course; physical training; propriety of granting degrees as a source of revenue, and the advisability of fixing an age requirement for applicants for degrees.

At Cambridge during the last academic year degrees were conferred as follows: D. D., 8; LL. D., 6; M. D., 18; Sc. D., 5; Litt. D., 1; B. D., 3; M. A., 364; LL. M., 4; M. C. (Master of Surgery), 2; M. B. (Bachelor of Medicine), 8; B. C., 78; B. A., 718; LL. B., 43. The list totals at a figure (1,255) that shames the output of our own degree factories. The most noteworthy features are the range and variety of the titles and the large proportion of M. A.'s.

Friends of the late Sir Leslie Stephen have subscribed £630 to endow a Cambridge lectureship in literature.

The number of enrolled members of Cambridge University during the last term is given in the *Cambridge Review* as 3,507. Girton and Newnham, the women's colleges, had 342 residents.

At Dublin eighty-six women students, seven of them from Oxford and seventy-nine from Cambridge, took the B. A. degree, and sixty-seven also took the M. A. One rose a round higher on the ladder of academic distinction, receiving the degree of Doctor of Science. During the last year 148 women have taken the B. A. at the Irish university, and [illegible] them have followed it up with the Master's degree. Dublin stands boldly for the granting of degrees to women.

Edinburgh University reports that its total invested funds amount to three-quarters of a million sterling, though only a tenth of the total is at the free disposal of the university governors. The enrolment at the Scotch institution is steadily increasing, standing now at 3,000, the highest since 1894. As in some of our own universities, the increase is bulked in the science schools, the arts courses tending to attract fewer students each year.

The Scottish universities are endeavoring to secure Parliamentary legislation conceding greater freedom of individual action.

The University of London has taken in the School of Tropical Medicine as a department in the university. The school was established under the initiative of Joseph Chamberlain, when he was Secretary of State for the Colonies.

University extension work in England is thoroughly organized, on an extensive scale, and since its inception thirty years ago has been increasingly successful. The Association to Promote the Higher Education of Working Men was founded two years ago, Aug. 23, 1903. The work is based upon "an associated effort of trades unions, cooperative societies, workingmen's clubs, and University Extension authorities."

Solicitation for Life Insurance a Necessity.

From the Insurance Press.

No one has ever yet succeeded in inducing healthy and desirable subjects for life insurance to present themselves without the intervention of an agent. The Mutual Life in 1880 offered a rate of premium much lower than that of any other company; the only result was to demoralize its agency force. No applicant voluntarily sought the Mutual Life, then even more than now the leading company of the country, despite the fact that its policies could be secured on more favorable terms than anywhere else.

But it cannot be denied, on the other hand, that the blind ambition to worship the God of Volume has resulted in the exaltation of the agent to a position of influence and emolument which a due regard to other interests and a consideration of sound business principles would deny to him. An increased mortality; an expense account of abnormal proportions; privileges in the policy contract so liberal as to be dangerous; financiering involving new and hitherto unsuspected methods of accounting—all these are the price paid for listening to the siren voices of lightning solicitors and the specious arguments of "million dollar writers."

On this side of the business of life insurance the light of publicity may with great propriety be thrown.

The Cabinet and the Presidency.

From the Elmira Daily Advertiser.

It is almost fifty years since a President was elected who had had previous Cabinet experience. James Buchanan was Secretary of State in Polk's Administration and returned from the legation in London to run for the Presidential nomination.

To be sure, in earlier days the Cabinet was considered a stepping stone to the White House, but this condition ceased long ago. So apparent is the fact that Senator Hoar once characterized the Cabinet as the place for an ambitious man to end his ambitions in.

It is not the intention here to show that Secretary Root cannot be nominated for President, but to demonstrate that if he is accorded the honor it will be because he is deserving of the confidence bestowed upon him, and not because he has any advantage of political influence.