The Sun.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 31, 1908.

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.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer of the Association, William M. Laffan, 170 Nassau street; Secretary of the Association, Franklin Bartlett, 5 Nassau street.

The daily and Sunday SUN is on sale in London at Murray's Exchange, Trafalgar Buildings, Northumberland avenue; Pall Mall American and Colonial Exchange, Carlton street, Regent street, and Daw's Steamship Agency, 17 Green street, Leicester Square.

Paris office, 32 Rue Louis le Grand. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel; Kiosque 77, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opéra, and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Italiens, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

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.

HE.

From Rudyard Kipling's poem "The King," renamed "The Old Issue" in his collected writings.

He shall peep and mutter; and the night shall bring
Watchers 'neath our window, lest we mock the King.

He shall take a tribute, toll of all our ware;
He shall change our gold for arms—arms we may not bear.

He shall break his Judges if they cross his word;
He shall rule above the Law calling on the Lord.

Proud and Sorry.

We are perhaps warranted in introducing the author of this communication as an old friend of THE SUN:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Can you call to mind any living American who has served his country more faithfully and brilliantly than Secretary TAFT has since the Spanish war?

"When President MCKINLEY was looking around for a man of the very highest calibre to govern the Philippines and finally selected Judge TAFT, was not his choice a compliment of great worth and significance?

"And is it in line with good common sense to refer to this man who brought order out of chaos in the Philippines and who has successfully met so many other difficult problems as a 'mere *locum tenens*'?

"If WILLIAM H. TAFT were to be elevated to the Chief Magistracy of this nation, do you believe that his great record in the far Pacific and in the War Department justifies you in intimating that he would be the mere echo of any other man?

"It would be interesting to know just what the brilliant SUN really does think of the able Secretary of War. Most Americans are mighty proud of him.

"EDMUND L. PENDLETON.

"MOUNT VERNON, January 30."

So are we—proud and sorry.

Mr. TAFT has been all that our correspondent says he has been. In the inscrutable ways of politics he has got himself into distressing juxtaposition with this dilemma:

If he is nominated and elected, and then follows the course which his Promoter's expectations and the loyalty of his own soul alike prescribe, he will be the echo, the mere *locum tenens*, referred to above.

If he is nominated and elected and does not follow the course indicated both by his Promoter's expectations and his own faithful, grateful nature, he will lay himself open to the charge most hateful to such a man, namely, that of having betrayed his benefactor and obtained the office of President by something very much like false pretences.

That is why, while proud of Mr. TAFT's past, we are sorry for his present; but we still have hopes of the emetic.

The Wrong Standard.

Simple and innocent, the Hon. EDWARD LAUTERBACH stood before the Republican county committee Wednesday evening and in his sweetest, most dulcet tones declared:

"The ostensible reason put forward by those who seemed to oppose Mr. HUGHES was that he had not come out and announced himself as a candidate and that his views on national issues were unknown. But when his name was presented at the Saratoga convention he reenunciated every plank of the platform adopted at the Chicago convention, and after doing that who could doubt but that he was enunciating Republican principles?"

The Chicago platform contained nothing to warn the nation of the approaching attack on property. It betrayed none of the plans for the assault on the railroads. It disclosed no word to affright or disturb the thrifty and forehanded citizen.

Were Mr. LAUTERBACH not entirely open and ingenuous he might be suspected of irony.

Counsel Fees for the Attorney-General.

Mr. GEORGE M. PALMER of Schoharie, the Democratic leader in the Assembly, has introduced into the lower house of the Legislature a bill to appropriate $50,000 for the expenses of the suit in the name of the People, at the instance of WILLIAM R. HEARST, against GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN, to test the title of the defendant to the office of Mayor of the city of New York.

Is not this amount a trifle large?

The salary of the Attorney-General under the Constitution is only $5,000 a year. We admit that this compensation is inadequate for the services of a lawyer in all respects competent for the office. Such a lawyer ought to be paid $15,000 a year. But assuming this to be the fact, and assuming that the conduct of the litigation concerning the Mayoralty demands the attention of a lawyer as good as the Attorney-General himself ought to be, this would require an expenditure of only $15,000 a year for special counsel. The suit ought to be carried to judgment in two years at most—or for $30,000 in all—which would be $20,000 less than Mr. PALMER's proposed appropriation.

We thoroughly believe in the doctrine that the laborer is worthy of his hire. It is quite right for the Attorney-General to prosecute the suit to settle the question whether Mr. MCCLELLAN was really elected Mayor or not. In his proceedings to that end he has been opposed by dilatory methods which have been unduly successful. But this is no reason why his action should be energized by the promise of excessive pay to special counsel. Fifteen thousand dollars a year ought to be enough to push the suit ahead "with all convenient speed," as the legal phrase is.

The people are not disposed to be niggardly in such a matter; but we venture to predict that Attorney-General JACKSON can procure the services of a highly qualified lawyer at this figure, who will give the Mayor's counsel all they want to attend to, and will engage not to put in any bill for extra work.

Another Crisis in New Hampshire.

The Hon. WINSTON CHURCHILL, a renowned politician and novelist of New Hampshire, has the honor to be one of the select counsellors, notables or prud'hommes consulted by the Grand Snark of the Universe. Mr. CHURCHILL is opposed to State bosses, but he loves the general boss, and in a letter to the Boston *Herald* he smites that caitiff crew "the Senatorial clique which is trying its best to defeat TAFT and the forward policies which the people of Senator GALLINGER's own State desire." Dr. GALLINGER's term expires next year. He is a sly old bird, and it is queer if he opposes policies, forward or backward, which the Granite State folks want.

However, the crime which produced the crisis that now thrusts Mr. CHURCHILL into reluctant publicity is the "turning down" by the Senatorial clique, at the instance of the crooked counselling GALLINGER and his colleague, of the nomination of the Hon. CHARLES FAIRBANKS as a Pension Agent. This is a crime which every good man must deplore. Senatorial courtesy ought to have made way for courtesy to the Vice-President. The Hon. CHARLES FAIRBANKS, of the sound and kind Dedham stock, should have been confirmed for his name if for no other reason, and there was sufficient other reason. Mr. CHURCHILL gives it:

"I recommended the appointment of Mr. CHARLES FAIRBANKS to the President, and I am proud of it, and I had the right of any citizen to do so. I made it clear to the President that if a majority of the delegation should unite on one man I should at once withdraw my request. Each Senator was so determined to have his man nominated that they told the President they could not agree."

Mr. CHURCHILL's modesty appears in this. Against a divided delegation his advice should be followed: to a united delegation he would sacrifice his candidate. The candidate was sacrificed to GALLINGER and BURNHAM and the Senatorial clique, and GALLINGER had the impudence to maintain that "some people will begin to understand that the Senate is a part of the appointing power."

While we grieve with Mr. CHURCHILL's grief we can't believe that anybody is so dense as to suppose that the Senate is a part of the appointing power. All powers exist, undivided and indivisible, in one person or personage. In New Hampshire or elsewhere he may be graciously pleased to allow a right of recommendation to a True Bill man, and none other is eligible for appointment save by special arrangement.

We commend to Mr. CHURCHILL in this bitter hour that ingenious work of fiction the "Treason of the Senate," by a brother artist of the Indiana school.

The King's Speech.

The speech of King EDWARD VII. at the opening of Parliament on Wednesday is interesting by reason of some omissions as well as on account of the stress laid upon certain subjects.

Not a word was said about the discontent of the inhabitants of British India by reason of the indignities to which their fellow countrymen have been subjected by the Transvaal Government, a discontent which of late has been acquiring dangerous proportions. On the very same day (January 29) Hindus, Mohammedans and Parsees were combining to hold a meeting at Bombay to protest against the humiliating registration by means of finger prints to which natives of India have been compelled, under penalty of imprisonment, to submit at Johannesburg. It is true enough, as the speakers at this meeting declared, that the word empire has lost its meaning when with impunity one subject may be ill treated by another, and that in view of the employment of Indian troops in the South African war and of the help which they were prepared to render Lord BEACONSFIELD in 1878 the Indian subjects of his Majesty have deserved better treatment. A still more ominous sign was the indignant sense of wrong expressed on the same day at the meeting held in Lahore, which was attended by influential Mohammedans of the Punjab. Fortunately on January 30 there came a reassuring telegram from Johannesburg to the effect that the difficulty between the Transvaal Government and the Asiatics had been settled on the basis of allowing the latter to use their signatures in registration instead of finger prints. This settlement is manifestly due to the urgent remonstrances of Mr. JOHN MORLEY, Secretary of State for India. We learn also that all the Indians imprisoned for refusing to comply with the registration act are to be released.

In two sections of the speech from the throne emphasis is laid on the actual and prospective effects of the new and cordial understanding which exists between Great Britain and Russia. The King pointed out that in consequence of the Anglo-Russian convention the British and Russian Governments had been able, notwithstanding the complicated and perturbed condition of Persia, to maintain tranquillity in that country. He might have added that the inchoate invasion of Persian territory by Turkish troops has apparently been stopped by the joint interposition of British and Russian Ambassadors at Constantinople. Still more significant is the announcement made elsewhere in the speech that Great Britain and Russia, with the cooperation doubtless of some other European Powers, have agreed to make proposals to the Ottoman Sultan for dealing effectually with the principal causes of the disturbances in Macedonia. Those proposals would, of course, have all the weight of an ultimatum were it understood that they would be backed by a Russian army and a British fleet.

Of importance also was the reference to the practical steps that will be taken to carry out the agreement reached at the second peace conference to establish at The Hague an international prize court. That court is not to begin operations until a body of international principles governing the disposition of prizes of war shall have been formulated with the concurrence of the chief signatory Powers, and a certain period ending in 1909 was allowed for the purpose. It now appears that the British Government is already considering the question of inviting representatives of the leading maritime nations to attend a conference in London next autumn with a view of defining certain points of international law for the guidance of the tribunal.

In that part of the speech which formulated the programme of domestic legislation complete reticence is observed concerning the intention of the Bannerman Government, more than once publicly declared, of adopting measures to limit the authority of the House of Lords. We infer that no definite move in that direction will be made during the present session of Parliament. There will be quite enough to occupy legislators if there are strenuous attempts to pass many of the bills which according to the King's speech are to be introduced. Among these measures may be mentioned the bill facilitating the acquisition of land by the peasantry in Scotland, which has been thrown out by the Lords, a bill amending the law on elementary education, which also the Lords are expected to resist, and the bill regulating the hours of labor in coal mines. Moreover the Ministers are now pledged by the speech from the throne to make no fewer than two distinct efforts to conciliate the Irish Nationalists. Not only will they offer what is hoped will be a satisfactory project for the improvement and extension of university education in Ireland, but they will propose such an amendment of the Irish land purchase act as will permit the compulsory acquisition of untenanted land used for grazing purposes, in order that the existing congestion in certain districts may be relieved. The latter scheme is almost certain to encounter inflexible opposition on the part of the huge Unionist majority in the upper house. On the whole a busy and exciting session of Parliament is clearly contemplated in the King's speech.

Government by Proxy?

We are so used to the absences of the Hon. WILLIAM H. TAFT from the seat of Government, and by this time so thoroughly convinced that the War Department is in efficient hands whether he is travelling in the eastern hemisphere or playing with his boom in our home provinces, these repeated electioneering tours of his have ceased to disturb our confidence in the nation's safety. Secretary TAFT exhibits a vast deal of capacity for itinerary when we consider that his success with the Republican nominating convention has been certified by the whole chorus of the Roosevelt officeholders. Apparently he feels that the inheritance should not be left to seek the legatee, and perhaps he shares his master's opinion that the reverent multitudes ought to see greatness at close quarters every now and then.

What concerns us, however, is the report from Washington to the effect that in his latest speechmaking excursion he is accompanied by Brigadier-General CLARENCE EDWARDS, chief of the Insular Bureau of the War Department. General EDWARDS is among the really competent and useful officials who keep the machinery in fruitful operation. Together with General AINSWORTH, the Adjutant-General, and Chief Clerk SCOFIELD, he represents the practical efficiency of the Department. It may be all right—no doubt it is. EDWARDS is one of the most gifted organizers ever known in the Government's official establishment, and it is conceivable that by this time he has reduced the Insular Bureau to a species of automatic, perpetual perfection. Nevertheless, there is a ferment of uneasiness at work. If Secretary TAFT takes General EDWARDS away with him upon a stumping circuit now, why may he not take General AINSWORTH and Chief Clerk JOHN SCOFIELD next week? And in such a case what would become of that particular subdivision of the Government? Of course, the engineer, the inspector, the quartermaster, the ordnance, the commissary and the medical contingents would run along as usual. They are in charge of trained veterans who know their business thoroughly and can by no means be utilized for purposes of party politics. But if Mr. TAFT's office seeking emergencies are to bereave us of General CLARENCE EDWARDS, why may not his campaign effect the occultation of AINSWORTH, SCOFIELD—the whole array of bureau chiefs, even Assistant Secretary OLIVER himself?

It is an alarming outlook, sure enough. What is possible in the War Department is equally possible in all the other departments. If the Hon. WILLIAM H. TAFT can order his subordinates to take the road and leave the Government to clerks and civil service understrappers, we see no reason why President ROOSEVELT may not by the same token and for the same purpose flood the whole country with Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries and bureau chiefs in the promotion of his policies and the certification of his wills and codicils.

A Lesson to the Police.

In Broad street, the main thoroughfare of Newark, MARCUS J. JACOBS, a theatrical manager, was killed last September by an automobile which Dr. WALTER H. MORRIS, a dentist, was driving at an unlawful rate of speed. Dr. MORRIS has just been convicted of manslaughter and sentenced to eighteen months imprisonment. The prompt trial and summary punishment of Dr. MORRIS will be heralded as another example of Jersey justice. Yet it may be doubted whether the newspaper reports of his sentence will be seen by a majority of the habitual scorchers who are looking forward to a season of their favorite amusement that will begin in about two months.

The end of March will find them on the driver's seat turning on the power and honking warnings to pedestrians to get out of the way. It is certainly not the fault of the automobile "sportsmen" if manslaughter is uncommon on highway and avenue; cases would be frequent enough if other users of the road had not learned to construe contributory negligence as a failure to flee at the approach of an automobile exceeding the speed limit. We doubt whether the fate of Dr. MORRIS, richly deserved because he ran away after mangling his victim, will impress the scorcher as anything but a case of hard luck.

But the police should be impressed—it ought to be a lesson to them. They were not half as vigilant last season as they should have been in enforcing the law; in fact the speed limit clause came to be almost a dead letter in many localities. Hence the great and increasing danger of pedestrians, drivers of horse vehicles, riders of bicycles, and children playing in the streets, all of them exposed to the fitful humor of the scorcher. The police power of New Jersey, and of New York for that matter, should realize that unless the scorcher is restrained by a constant fear of arrest troublesome cases of manslaughter are bound to occur. People will be slow to get out of the way, or too old or too young to move quickly, or unfortunately deaf. And then there is to be considered the risk of automobilists who obey the law and who are in a large majority indisputably. They also suffer from the high spirits and blunt sensibilities of the scorchers. A certain responsibility rests upon the police; in fact the whole responsibility, since the scorchers acknowledge none.

So we say, in the interests of law abiding automobilists as well as for the sake of the heedless and hapless who are frequently threatened by the wheels of the juggernaut, that the Morris conviction should be a lesson to the police.

Mr. BRYAN may not be elected or may not carry a State here and there, but I say he will do better: he will convince the world of his own manhood.—*From a speech in the House of Representatives by* ROBERT M. WALLACE *of Arkansas.*

Isn't it rather early to extenuate Mr. BRYAN's defeat in the Presidential election?

Mr. J. MARTIN MILLER, formerly United States Consul at Reims, France, was perhaps ill advised in resigning his position in the service. It seems that he was a very active official whose reports disclosed both intelligence and industry and promised distinct efficiency in the future. His complaint that the salary attached to the place was inadequate to a development of its possibilities of usefulness rested upon most valid grounds. Indeed, there is every reason to believe that this inequality will be to some extent at least corrected by the present Congress, and this in considerable part as a result of his very lucid representations. It is to be regretted on Mr. MILLER's account, if not for the sake of the Consular service also, that Mr. MILLER did not postpone his resignation. He had been recommended by such men as Senator DRYDEN of New Jersey and the late R. R. HITT of Illinois, and the State Department had reached the conclusion that Reims was entitled to a more energetic financial exploitation.

The Hon. ROBERT MINOR WALLACE, M. C., of Magnolia, Ark., is scarcely fulfilling the promise of his early days in the Congress. He leaped to light as the speaker of three unspoken but beautifully printed speeches in one day in the House, to be accurate, in one minute, the time allotted him. Tuesday he made but a single speech, and this was actually delivered. We had expected better things of the Magnolia Blossom. Yet there is sweetness and greatness in this effort. Mr. BRYAN, we learn incidentally from it, while not infallible and subject to some mistakes, is positively or probably inspired:

"Into the columns of the *Commoner* Mr. BRYAN crowds pungent paragraph, earnest thought and heartfelt love of country and humankind, until its readers feel that upon the ear of the editor-statesman has fallen perhaps the same voice that said to ISAIAH: 'Take thee a great roll and write in it with a man's pen.'"

Yet he is "human," though only in a sense, we suppose. For him the process of deification, complete in Mr. ROOSEVELT's case, is going on.

Real Fireproofing.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* My letter on fireproof buildings has been horribly criticised by Mr. L. Graves, who states very kindly that Mr. R. L. Humphrey of the United States Geological Survey is not down on concrete, though he thinks some of the buildings of concrete in the various cities unsafe. What Mr. Humphrey thinks is shown in his report to the Survey when he states: "Concrete is probably the best fireproofing material, because as shown by experience its stiffness will enable it to support not only the steel within if the latter is softened by heat but perhaps the structure itself."

Now, the value of a structure or a method of fireproofing is largely determined by what portion of the structure is left for available use after the fire. To support my claim that the San Francisco fire proved that tile floors were not fireproof, or as fireproof as concrete floors, I quoted from the United States Geological Survey, according to Mr. Graves, a few "meagre paragraphs." This was to economize space, as the whole report is a victory for concrete construction over that of tile: any one may get the report for the asking. Among the various buildings in San Francisco that were damaged on account of the failure of terra cotta tile as fireproofing are the Spring Valley Water Company's building, the Mutual Life, Mills, Crocker, Emporium, Floyd, Chronicle, Care buildings and others. Many of these were completely wrecked by the fire.

Mr. Graves asserts that the Parker Building was no criterion to go by and points to all the new buildings using tile, the Singer, West Street, &c. The fact that these buildings use tile does not prove this type to be fireproof, even if they have been designed by the best architects in the city. The Parker Building is the only one of that type that has been exposed to fire, and it failed completely. The excuse that eight inch tile was used, while the more recent practice is to use twelve-inch tile, is no excuse for failure to be fireproof: the eight inch tile was strong enough for the floor loads until the fire, and whether the twelve inch tile will act better in a hot fire remains to be seen, when some day a fire starts in one of these buildings out of reach of water from good or bad hose.

It is admitted that terra cotta is one of the most fireproof materials, but it cannot be or is not applied properly to fireproof steel structures; it allows the heat to reach the beams, which deflect. This loosens the tile and the whole panel falls out.

That the architects are gradually working toward concrete is shown by the increase in number of the buildings in the last few years that are being built of reenforced concrete and the skyscrapers of steel, which are fireproofed with it, as the new Metropolitan, which will be the highest building in the world when completed, or the Hudson River terminal buildings, which are bigger than any two buildings in New York put together. Yes, the architects, and better still, the public, are learning what is and what is not fireproof.

ROBERT E. CARRICK.

NEW YORK, January 30.

PRINTS AT THE GROLIER CLUB.

Antiquarians, lovers of rare engravings, searchers after the quaint in early American history may spend pleasant and profitable hours in the gallery of the Grolier Club, 29 East Thirty-second street, which is open from 10 A. M. to 6 P. M., and until February 15. This club is like one of those legendary caverns in the "Arabian Nights" wherein the intruder could gaze upon a fabulous pellmell of riches, not, however, without the uneasy feeling that the entire show might be whisked away before his eyes if some Afrit cried: Presto, begone! The Groliers have so much artistic wealth stowed away in their snug little house that they could cry many times Presto! and immediately replace each vanishing exhibition by another. Especially affluent are they in Americana. The particular exhibit now on is devoted to early American engravers, 1727-1850, and with a catalogue that mounts up to 300 and more some notion of the resources of this unique organization may be gleaned.

As the annotator of the catalogue truly says: "Until the late William S. Baker in 1875 published his 'American Engravers and Their Works,' the existence of engravers upon copper seems to have been persistently ignored by writers upon this branch of art." The late gentle connoisseur of West Arch street, Philadelphia, in addition to forming an admirable collection and being an authority upon the engraved portraits of Washington, did critical yeoman service in the cause of American copper and steel engraving. It was a pious thought to quote his name in connection with an important exhibition such as the present one. Since his volume others of wider scope and more erudition have appeared, but to Baker belongs the credit due a pioneer. The first woodcut portrait, continues the annotator, of which we have any record in this country is that of the Rev. Richard Mather, credited to John Foster as the engraver, and appearing in a life of Mather published by Foster in Cambridge, New England, in 1670. As may be surmised, wood engraving during those artistically barren times was chiefly employed in the title page of almanacs and newspaper headings. In 1652 Joseph Jenckes of Lynn, Colony of Massachusetts Bay, was the first definitely known to have engraved upon metal for reproductive purposes. He cut the dies for the Pine Tree shilling. Massachusetts in 1690 issuing paper money, the demand for copperplate engraving was created. Silversmiths and goldsmiths undertook engraving of almost every genre. It was all in the day's work. Many of the best engravers were also banknote engravers—Leney, Rollinson, Tiebout, Peter Maverick, A. B. Durand, the latter our most noted line engraver. With the Ives half tone process and subsequent inventions engraving is almost become a lost art.

Naturally there is some mediocre work in this show; it would be expecting too much to ask for the brilliancy, finish, variety of the classic English and French school. A rather hard line and painstaking accurate style prevail in the majority of the early men's work. Like the prose of the period, simplicity is sought for and ornament eschewed as an invention of the old boy; that infernal tempter who occupied so large a portion of our forefathers' conscience. The catalogue opens with Abernethie, 1785, ends with Yeager, 1816. There are also specimens of American bank note engraving and portraits of American engravers. Some autographs are included. A comical print by Amos Doolittle (1754-1832) is called "John Bull in Distress." It represents a half bull, half peacock, pierced through the neck by a great hornet. The hornet says: "Free Trade and Sailors' Rights, you old rascal"; the bull-peacock lows or screams, "Boo-oo-oo!" This plate was duly registered under its title, 1813, by Doolittle. It would please, to-day, the orotund William Bryan, and all twisters of the British lion's tail.

Asher Brown Durand (1796-1886) a partner and apprentice of Peter Maverick, has several numbers to his credit, the Ariadne, after Vanderlyn, being an excellent example of pure line. There are numerous portraits of celebrated statesman and actors (nearly identical professions, when you come to think it over). John Philip Kemble, by H. H. Houston; two of Charles Matthews by David Claypoole Johnson; Benjamin Rush, by William R. Jones; Marquis de Lafayette, by Francis Kearny; Zebulon M. Pike, by James Kennedy; Robert Fulton, William Shakespeare, George Washington, Elias Hicks, and James Mulliken's The Bloody Massacre, "perpetrated in King street, Boston, March 5, 1770, by a party of ye 29th Regt." Then follows the list of the killed and wounded. Portraits of John Milton, Samuel Adams, Stephen Decatur and James Honeyman, the latter a rector of Trinity Church, Newport, about 1774. Shades of Thackeray!

A mezzotint of unusual richness by William Page (1811-1885) depicts Edwin Forrest as *Spartacus*. It was published in 1834. The noblest gladiator of them all stands a veritable colossus in all the vigor of his early manhood—he was only 28—attired in Roman style, standing, shield across breast, sword in right hand. The sombre yet brilliant eyes, the bull neck and tremendous girth are all here. No wonder this man made our parents sit up in their stalls when his voice boomed across the footlights. The plate is after the painting of Page himself, for it was no unusual thing then to find painters engravers; while in our decadent days it is rather difficult to discover even an engraver, though painters have multiplied like locusts.

But let us hurry on. The name of Paul Revere (1735-1818) catches the eye. The son of a silversmith, this famous patriot learned to engrave upon metal. His John Hancock, the Bloody Massacre—the same theme as the one above mentioned—Boston ships landing troops, and the portraits of Gardiner Chandler and Jared Ingersoll of New Haven. John Sartain, born in London, 1808, died at Philadelphia, October 25, 1897, a venerable figure, close friend of Edgar Allan Poe, and father of William Sartain, the well known painter, is represented by a portrait of Charles Chauncey after Thomas Sully, in mezzotint, and one of William Penn. James Smillie, a capital line engraver of landscape, is seen in a characteristic subject. And we could fill columns with other once distinguished but now forgotten names. There is John Vallance, who engraved in stipple, the head of Hugh Blair, D. D., or Charles Cushing Wright, with his line vignette of Henry Rutgers, Esq. It is not necessary to add that any one with a drop of patriotic blood in his veins will secure a card from the secretary and visit this unique exhibition.

At Wunderlich's Gallery, 220 Fifth avenue, near Twenty-sixth street, Mr. Kennedy—who had an important hand in the arrangement of the Grolier show—has framed half a hundred portraits of Ladies after Reynolds, Hoppner, Romney, Gainsborough, done in mezzotint and stipple by the renowned masters of that supple craft; Ward, Smith, Watson, MacArdell, Jones, S. M. Reynolds and others. Portraits of Mrs. Siddons and Peg Woffington are on view. An Italian dancer after Gainsborough, a high keyed mezzotint, is rarely attractive; the lady's skirts swirl as if in a tornadic zephyr, and her movements are graceful and varied. She was a favorite of his Grace—but hush! The curious and successful process of mezzotinting in colors may be seen in the Anne of Cleves, after Holbein, the engraver being a resident of upper Manhattan, Mr. S. Arlent Edwards. Artistically the result is effective. The plate is achieved at one printing.

NAMES.

Mystery, Originality and Cheerfulness of Nomenclature.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I am glad that "Student" has written you concerning "Much Resounding Names." His suggestion opens a field of vast endeavor, and I desire here to begin the promulgation of what I believe to be a propagable idea—an obsession distinctly inherent in the mere observation of names—signs over shop windows—and what Mr. Venus doubtless would call the nomenclature of the "human warious."

Anciently some associates with myself formed a sort of syndicate for the exchange of suggestion, briefly a Society of Earnest Students in Nomenclature. I quote from a letter received this morning:

There is a corporation in Philadelphia which reenforces the edges of curbs with steel. It is called the Protected Steel Curb Company, and its business is to build proper gutters. Near its office is a grocer who displays the sign Gilt Edged Butter. Being transposed in the minds of the elect this sign becomes (with proper consideration of orthography) Built Edged Gutter. We thus observe how the association of ideas may bring together antipodean interests.

I myself observed in Philadelphia the sign "P. Schmaker." Exclaiming "Blessed be the P. Schmakers!" I ran nimbly away. Further I saw the sign in Seventh street, "Hosea Waterer, Seedsman." This, it seems, should lead the intending gardener to purchase seeds in quantity. There is the hose, the water and the suggestion of growing plants and swelling bulbs in the mere mouthing of the name.

In Sixteenth street, Denver, Messrs. Cool & High transact business—truly an appropriate firm name for such altitudes. In Providence there is a sign fixed over a laundry informing the wayfarer that Mr. Wah Shung labors within. To one obsessed of the sign language it is intimately apparent that it is quite proper to have the wash hung out. In Wilmington an attorney's sign reads J. P. Cann. The true sign philosopher immediately remembers Immanuel Kant, thus recognizing the eternal law of compensation.

No properly educated person can possibly forget Mr. A. Ward's discovery of the sign of Call & Tuttle in Summer street, Boston, and how, entering, he observed that he had called, and desired to know if he could tuttle. Now I believe that the gentlest humorist who ever lived—this same A. Ward—was the unacknowledged founder of a school of sign language. That your correspondent "Student" should have found delight in the names which appear strange to us, whether or not we are devoted to the study of psychological chemistry, is a fact which calls forth peans of joy. And if I may be pardoned the phrase in this connection, let me move "Student's" election as a compulsory member of our society indicated above.

It may not appear quite apparent to the unregenerate, but this society is a distinct move toward the day of ultimate cheerfulness. To observe a sign, a name, a locution of any sort upon public highways, which in and of itself suggests an idea calling forth a smile is primarily a help in the day's work. I therefore believe that the foundation of the Society of Earnest Students in Nomenclature may be productive of good. To the earnest student this work can mean nothing more than the utilization of time which might be spent in shorter and uglier manners. To smile, and to let men see you smile, is an achievement which comes perilously near making sunshiny days. There is a depth of good philosophy even in that. H. P.

WILMINGTON, Del., January 29.

Prayer for Light.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Several friends of mine have noticed it, and I am pretty well convinced of the fact myself, that it happened to me to be born dull of comprehension. So you will excuse me when I say that, much as I like to read your editorials, sometimes I cannot understand them. Take that double leaded column of Tuesday entitled "Mr. Roosevelt's Divina Commedia." It interests me very much, only I would like to know just what you are driving at.

Isn't it the duty of our good President to enforce the law? When that implacable reformer the Attorney-General of the United States gets his eye upon a covey, why isn't it all right for the Commander in Chief to give the word in Dewey fashion, "If you are ready, Bonaparte, you can fire"?

Am I to understand that there was a list of corporations drawn up, with the amount denoted that each should subscribe, and that the memorandum was put into Mr. Harriman's hands by the person most vitally interested? How can I believe that the White House could have been made the scene of such a transaction?

Won't you be so kind as to tell me in a few words what was the charge brought by Judge Parker about corporation campaign contributions to elect the Republican nominee; and what were the terms of that electrical denial addressed to the American people by President Roosevelt? If you can compress the charge and the indignant refutation of it into a few crisp sentences I will try to see if I can find a clue to the mystery that seems to brood over the editorial just referred to.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 29. AJAX.

Admiral Melville's Opinion of the Navy.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* At a meeting of the Commandery in Chief of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, held at St. Paul, Minn., in the Academy of Music of that city, April, 1893, in a public address at that time and place, I finished my oration with the following words:

The navy of the United States in its personnel and its material, man for man, ton for ton, gun for gun, has not its superior on the face of the globe.

This was my opinion at that time, and I have never had reason to change my opinion, notwithstanding all the newspaper reports to the contrary. GEORGE W. MELVILLE,

Rear Admiral, United States Navy, Retired.

PHILADELPHIA, January 29.

Friar Bartholomew's Dragon.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In the middle of the thirteenth century the English Franciscan Bartholomew published his great work on "The Properties of Things." The reverend naturalist devoted much thought to the dragon. He thus discourseth: "The dragon is most greatest of all serpents, and oft he is drawn out of his den, and riseth up into the air, and the air is moved by him, and also the sea swelleth against his venom, and he hath a crest, and reareth his tongue, and hath teeth like a saw, and hath strength, and not only in teeth but in tail, and gnaweth with biting and within stinging. Whom he findeth he slayeth. Oft four or five of them fasten their tails together, and rear up their heads, and sail over the sea to get good meat. * * * The cause why the dragon desireth the blood of the elephant is the coldness thereof, by the which the dragon desireth to cool himself. Jerome saith that the dragon is a full thirsty beast, insomuch that he openeth his mouth against the wind to quench the burning of his thirst in that wise. Therefore, when he seeth ships in great wind he flieth against the sail to take the cold wind, and overthroweth the ship."

This seems to be nature faking all right, and of a pretty stiff order, too. But can it be that the ghostly father was prophesying concerning an animal which had not then arrived?

WESTFIELD, Mass., January 29. L. E. PHANT.

Grand Army Men on the Stage.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Coarse use of our flag and unintentional insult of the Grand Army of the Republic for business ends ought to be frowned upon instead of cheered to the echo. In a widely advertised play, a field slain soldier's swaddling infant, after being reared to youth by a post commander and his comrades, steals the fund scraped together in pennies and dimes by his benefactors, who have lived in the hope of having in their old age a post hall for their company. The youth is horsewhipped, arrested, tried and put into the penitentiary, but is afterward pardoned for good behavior and marries an heiress.

Maimed veterans are portrayed as a set of revelling, quarrelling sots, greedily emptying whiskey canteens, babbling songs as they stagger from the stage. A post commander removes his badges and resigns after having been a hero. The play will not impress patriotism upon our youth or bring due respect to our old soldiers.

NEW YORK, January 30. NORBURNE BARNARD.

Declined Without Thanks.

From the Korea Daily News.

The head of the Il-chin-hoi and his Japanese friend write to inform us of their return from the interior and we are invited in the words of our translator to have "an intimate conversation and a small drinking with them." We shall not go.

REVISING THE LAWS.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 30.—The Senate and the House have been using some of the time at their disposal until the appropriation bills are reported by the committees in a discussion of the revised and codified criminal laws of the United States. It is a work of great importance and of huge proportions.

In 1897 a special commission was appointed for the purpose of revising and codifying a collection of Federal laws which is in very grave need of just that treatment. In 1901 the work of this commission was extended to the revision and codification of all the permanent laws of the United States. Its report was submitted in December, 1906. For the saving of time and labor in both houses a joint committee was appointed, consisting of five Senators and five Representatives, for a consideration of the results of the work of the commission. After months of patient and painstaking industry the joint committee reported to the Senate and the House the bills now pending. They embrace the criminal code in the form approved by the committee. As stated by the gentleman (Mr. Moon of Pennsylvania) having charge of the bill in the House:

The object of this bill is to perfect the organic law of the land; to present the permanent laws of the United States in the most authentic and authoritative form, to the end that these organic laws, these great fundamental legislative declarations, shall exist before the country in such clear, systematic and conspicuous form that they may be known to all men; that the great principles of life, liberty and property that they are intended to safeguard and make clear shall be extricated from the great confusion into which they have been allowed to fall by many years of inattention, and be written clearly and legibly on our statute books as forcible and conspicuous evidences of our national justice, national probity and national advancement.

The laws of the country, as they now stand, are embodied in the Revised Statutes, second edition, 1878, in supplements and in volumes of Statutes at Large. The revision of 1878 was the first and the last in our history. These volumes contain laws that have been declared unconstitutional, laws that have been superseded and laws that have been virtually duplicated by later legislation. They are confused and confusing, in many instances badly edited and badly indexed, a jumble of legislative enactments which is a reproach if not a disgrace to a civilized country. The grave need of a classification of this collection of statutory laws was clearly shown by Representative Houston. He said:

The laws that create many of the offences defined in our statutes are hidden away in appropriation bills in such manner as to be almost undiscoverable, with nothing in the title of the bill or its subject that would give the least index or indication that it contained such a statute creating a public offence, the commission of which offence subjects an American citizen to fine and imprisonment.

The citizens of a country are supposed not only to obey its laws but also to know what those laws are, so that they may not even unwittingly violate them. Here are thousands of laws, covering the enactments of more than a century, and many of them are so obscure or so blindly drawn or so contradictory in their terms and provisions that our lawyers and courts are frequently puzzled to find them and to understand them when they are found. As they are now brought before our lawmakers, section by section, their faults are revealed, and there is wide difference of opinion with regard to many of them and as well regarding the proper method of procedure for their correction. These differences are inevitable. As stated by Senator Heyburn in introducing the bill in the Senate, the work of the committee has been the bringing together of all statutes and parts of statutes relating to the same subject; the omission of redundant and obsolete enactments, and such alteration as seemed necessary "to reconcile the contradictions, supply the omissions and amend the imperfections of the original text." In so wide a field there is ample room for many differences of view and opinion.

The magnitude of the task of revising and codifying "all laws of the United States of a permanent and general nature in force at the time when the same shall be reported" is perhaps better realized when it is known that the penal code now under consideration includes only 342 out of some 9,000 sections of law.

At the present rate of progress in the undertaking only the youngest members of Congress will live to see the work fully completed, and by that time there will be much to be added to it. It may therefore be expected that a different plan will be adopted and that the work will go on to completion within a reasonable time.

Attack on Gambrinus.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* We read a lot about our fellow citizens of German extraction being greatly agitated over the so-called blue laws and the efforts to regulate the Sunday trade of the saloons. Conventions of German-Americans are being held here and in other parts of the country, denouncing all efforts to create a decent American Sunday. The cry of these Germans of "Give me beer or give me death," is to say the least obnoxious, for while other nationalities are equally fond of their drink, you never hear of Irish or French societies demanding in mass meetings that the laws of this country should be construed according to their idea and their thirst.

I cannot believe that the better class of Germans of this country take an active part in these beer demanding demonstrations. It is almost impossible to conceive that when the former subjects of the Kaiser come to this country they forget everything else but their love for beer. I have spoken to quite a number of German-American business men, citizens who have become truly Americanized, and they ridicule and condemn the actions of their countrymen, who are evidently anxious to make the world believe that there is nothing dearer or nearer to a German heart than beer.

It seems strange that those Germans whom I have in mind should never interest themselves in loftier ideals. Whenever the question of beer pops up, however, the "Furor teutonicus" breaks loose and Uncle Sam or Father Knickerbocker is threatened with all sorts of things if he should dare attempt to lessen the flow of the amber fluid.

Isn't it high time for the better class among our German-American citizens to raise their voices in protest against this everlasting cry for beer? There is something impressive in an honest fight, whenever "personal liberty" is in danger, but with the class of Germans I have reference to "personal liberty" is synonymous with beer. FRANK W. MILLER.

NEW YORK, January 30.

American Jail at Shanghai.

From the Shanghai Mercury.

At the moment the legal minds of the United States Court are troubled over more than one knotty point, and among their hard problems is one presented by the American jail. Some time ago, it may be remembered, two men, Bishop and Gould, were sentenced to two years imprisonment each, and since then they have been confined in what does duty for a jail at the rear of the American consular buildings. The practice of allowing prisoners out for exercise under supervision has been discontinued, and now the only exercise these men can enjoy is a walk in the cramped passage running along the back of the prison. Under these conditions it is recognized by the authorities that it is almost impossible for them to keep the prisoners in such close confinement for the term mentioned. It was originally intended when these men were convicted that they should be removed to San Quentin, California, in company with any others who might find themselves in similar circumstances in the meanwhile; but now a hitch has occurred. An appeal has been intimated in the case of these two men—though whether it will be taken is a question—and it is stated that should the men be removed and the appeal sustained the United States Government will be under the necessity of sending them back to Shanghai in order that they may formally be released. Like the rest of United States extraterritorial law, the right of removal is somewhat hazy, and thus the authorities are faced with the keeping of prisoners in a place too small to be healthy or having another of their legal rulings smashed up.