The Sun.

SATURDAY, JULY 10, 1909.

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.

All checks, money orders, &c., to be made payable to THE SUN.

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. The office of Secretary of the Association is temporarily vacant.

London office, Effingham House, 1 Arundel street, Strand. The daily and Sunday SUN are on sale in London at the 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.

The Hearty Approval of Africa.

Need we say that the Roosevelt-Taft socialistic tax on corporate incomes, which is depended upon to change the whole attitude of the Federal Government toward property within State lines, has the enthusiastic approval of the good Dr. LYMAN ABBOTT, the fastidious Dr. HAMILTON MABIE and the rest of the able associates now in this country, including the alert and enterprising advertising manager of the *Outlook?* The Contributing Editor himself might almost have written these words:

"Since the Federal Government has both the right and duty to regulate corporations, and as there is at hand this measure by which such regulation can in a degree be secured by the imposition of a tax which will work no practical injustice, the common sense procedure is not to wait for something else, but to levy the tax *and take the first step toward Federal regulation.*

"The Federal corporation excise tax is the first step toward placing corporate industry in America under the only power that is big enough to control and regulate it—the United States Government."

We earnestly hope that this fine and acute appreciation of the significance of the Roosevelt-Taft tax on corporate incomes as a socialistic rather than a revenue measure will not escape the attention of our friends the conservative Senators. How it will thrill their honest souls to know that Africa applauds and is with them heart and hand in the revolutionary enterprise!

We hope especially that Senator ALDRICH of Rhode Island will not miss the *Outlook's* tribute to his services as a promoter of socialistic reform. We hope particularly that the Hon. ELIHU ROOT, junior Senator from the Empire State, will not overlook the *Outlook's* interpretation of the distinguished part he has played in this business.

"The very men in Congress," says THEODORE ROOSEVELT'S Æolian harp, "who heretofore have been apologists for irresponsible corporate power have been forced by a skilful manœuvre of the President to support the measure."

Russia, China and the United States.

According to a telegram from Pekin our Chargé d'Affaires, conforming to instructions from our State Department, has protested formally against the ratification of the convention lately concluded between China and Russia with reference to the control of the municipalities adjoining the northern or Russian section of the so-called Chinese Eastern Railway, crossing Manchuria from north to south.

We infer then that for the present the convention will not be ratified, and it is to the interest of the United States that unless materially changed it should remain permanently inoperative. We desire and have a treaty right to demand a strict maintenance of the "open door" not only as regards the Russian part of the railway named but also in respect to the southern and more important section, as to which Japan would certainly exact from China a concession equivalent to that embodied in the pending convention with Russia. It may be remembered that last autumn our State Department protested at Pekin against the attempt then made by the Russian authorities in northern Manchuria to gain political control of the railway settlements under the pretext of policing the railway line. That protest was successful, but Russia did not abandon her purpose, and is again trying to attain it by the present convention.

A close inspection of the details of the Chino-Russian convention will disclose its significance, although at first sight it looks reasonable. The convention provides that all the important railway towns shall be governed by municipal councils the members of which shall be chosen at elections in which all the inhabitants of the municipalities, without regard to nationality, shall be eligible on certain property qualifications to vote. The franchise qualification is ownership of a specified amount of real estate or the payment of designated amounts in real estate rental or in taxes. Each municipal council is to elect from its members a president and also an executive board of three, to whom are to be added one member appointed by the Chinese taotai or prefect of the municipality, and one member appointed by the Russian director of the Chinese Eastern Railway. We should mention that the president of the municipal council is ex officio chairman of the executive board, which as its name implies carries out the council's ordinances. The council, by the way, has power to legislate upon all questions concerning the municipality, except that where institutions are established by restricted interests they are to be supported and controlled by those institutions exclusively. For example, an American school would depend entirely for its maintenance upon Americans and would be managed solely by them. So with the churches, hospitals and clubs established by the different nationalities.

So far all looks fair enough. The objectionable feature of the convention is the provision that all ordinances of a municipal council must in order to be valid receive the joint approval of the Chinese taotai and of the Russian director of the railway. When so approved an ordinance is to be binding upon all the inhabitants of the municipality concerned; but if not approved by both officials it must be returned to the council for revision. If again passed by a three-fourths vote the ordinance becomes effective. To this last named provision, however, there is an exception which practically makes every ordinance subject to Russian approval. It is stipulated in the convention that "measures concerning public interest and municipal finance," even when passed by a council over the veto of the Chinese taotai and Russian director, or one of them, must be submitted to the Chinese president of the railway in Pekin and to the Russian chief administrator of the railway at St. Petersburg. If not approved by both of these officials the ordinance does not go into effect. Obviously this arrangement gives the Russian chief administrator the last word so far as the government of the settlements on the northern section of the Chinese Eastern Railway is concerned.

It is not surprising that our State Department should regard such an agreement as a violation of the "open door" to which Russia as well as China is pledged. The convention, as we see, excludes the United States from any voice in the formulation or execution of the municipal regulations, while it proposes to bind Americans resident in the railway settlements of northern Manchuria to be controlled by the ordinances. Our State Department holds that for administrative purposes the status of the railway settlements is the same as that of the treaty ports. It is well known that under the extraterritoriality provisions of our treaty with China Americans residing in China's treaty ports are subject to "the jurisdiction of the United States consular officers." In view of all the facts it is understood that our Government demands, first, that United States consular officers in the railway settlements shall be consulted as to any municipal ordinances to be issued; and secondly, that no such municipal regulations shall become binding upon Americans until the diplomatic representative of the United States at Pekin has signified his approval of them.

The Rescue of Plymouth Rock.

In another column we reprint the editorial comment of the Boston *Daily Advertiser* upon our poor effort to rescue Plymouth Rock from the vandalism of the latter day Pilgrims and Puritans. We present this document not in anger, not in bitterness, but because we believe it perfectly indicates the spirit and the temper in which any attempt to preserve a historic landmark is received in the headquarters of culture beside the Charles. Reading this we feel sure that all Americans whom patriotic emotion stirs will see how hopeless it is to expect the restoration of Plymouth Rock by its present custodians.

It is no part of our purpose to permit the torrent of abuse here embodied to turn us from our great work. The question is not the preservation or the pollution of New York shrines: it is the salvation of Plymouth Rock. It is true that we are surprised at the suggestion that New York has permitted the destruction of the Palisades. Of course it is unfair to expect our Boston critics to recognize that the Palisades, so far as New York city is concerned, are alien territory, that the land across the Hudson from this town lies in New Jersey. But we are well aware that the world outside of Boston knows this comparatively simple geographical fact, and this knowledge removes any need of defence on our part.

Again, we are a little astonished at the suggestion that the enterprise of this city should be suspected of any design to plaster with advertising patriotic shrines. Who was it invented Plymouth Rock "pants"? Was it New York or Boston commercial iconoclasm that saw in the historic point of departure of New England a trade mark for unmentionable garments? Are we mistaken in recalling the day when even the sacred precincts of Faneuil Hall were infringed upon by the unsightly exhortation of the tailor? When the stepping stone of the Pilgrims became the trade manual of the trousers maker, did the responsibility rest with Manhattan?

Or, once more, is it quite fair to turn the attempt to save Plymouth Rock aside by an assault upon our subway, that "wonderful relic"? We are not overproud of our subway. But with all its iniquities, was it ever allowed to invade an ancient graveyard? Are we mistaken when we recall that hideous sacrilege accompanied the building of the Boston subway, when from the Central Burying Ground on the Common there was ruthlessly torn the sacred dust of the elder generations, when the bones of the fathers were flung from their hallowed graves that Brookline and Cambridge might have rapid transit? Were not some of these dead themselves descendants of that ancient Mayflower band?

Nor is it necessary now to launch into a defence of our parks. It is true that foliage fails; but why? Is the foliage of the Boston parks so tropical in its luxuriance? It is true that the browntail moth has begun his ravages in this town. But whence comes he? Was it not a Somervillian—a citizen of suburban Boston—who first turned him loose upon an unsuspecting community? The gypsy moth, too, how many millions did Massachusetts spend in propagating that pest that its neighbors might share the suffering? Smooth as the bald cranium our parks may yet become, when Boston's bugs are all come, but how are Boston's parks now?

We shall not enter into any argument about the care we have bestowed upon our churches. Let the unprejudiced stranger to New York and Boston first see St. Paul's, with its unviolated graveyard—its half acre of sleep—its unprofaned resting place of our great dead, with all the towers of trade flung back—halted—while the green lawns and the kind shade trees give pleasure to the living without doing violence to the honor of the dead. Let him then seek out the Old South in Boston and see there the trespass of commerce—the pitiful restrictions of that noble edifice, the overshadowing and overhanging office building that so far as man can do it deprives this splendid monument of its inherent and natural dignity. On such impartial judgment we are content to rest our case. The very State House, the old State House, cited as proof positive of Boston's affection for its past—what but a subway station to East Boston has this edifice now become?

It is not to defend New York nor to glorify our town, however, that we have enlisted in this war. Let the *Daily Advertiser* justly censure us for actual neglect, exhort us to the abatement of some real nuisance, and our response shall be grateful, not grudging—thanks and not a tirade. In undertaking the rescue of Plymouth Rock we presented not empty charges nor general indictment, but a photograph. Upon the degradation there authentically set forth we have based our appeal—an appeal that has awakened echoes all over this broad land save only in Boston, where sullen silence has now given way to violent abuse. We deplore this abuse, we regret this injection of sectional feeling, of local prejudice; but our duty is too plain to permit us to hesitate.

Plymouth Rock shall be restored. The trade mark of the "pant" maker shall be restored to the protection of the patriot. But day by day the sad fact is brought home to us that the salvation must come from without, that the Pilgrim patriots from a distance must march in a new crusade to rescue this holy shrine of American national history.

The Municipal Automobile Scandal.

There has seldom been a more notorious scandal concerning the municipal administration of New York than the use of public motor cars by city officials for private purposes. Every frequenter of suburban pleasure resorts knows about it. Joy rides in automobiles purchased out of the public treasury and owned by the municipality are of constant occurrence. Women are continually being conveyed hither and thither in these vehicles, which are supposed to be devoted exclusively to the public service. All this goes on day after day, week after week and month after month. Yet people simply laugh and nobody does anything about it.

We all of us seem quite contented to wink at the abuse and pay for it, and it may justly be said that if people like that sort of thing that sort of thing is the sort of thing they like.

It is simply a mockery, however, to talk about the existence of any strong and abiding sense of public morality in a community where such an abuse is tolerated without any real protest. People must be indifferent to this phase of corruption or they would hardly ignore it.

How would it do to require the chauffeur of every municipal motor car to file a sworn statement of the daily movements and waits of his automobile for publication on the following day in the *City Record*, together with the names and addresses of all his passengers?

If the present uses to which these cars are put are unobjectionable no official can possibly object to a simple police regulation of this character. We predict that such sworn statements would furnish mighty interesting reading.

The Life Insurance Managers.

Apparently there is no depth of wickedness to which the life insurance companies are not prepared to go in their efforts to obtain amendments to the Hughes legislation in this State, and fortunately there is no question as to the alertness and conscientious zeal of the authorities in exposing them. Recently one company announced that to keep within the legal limit of new business it had been obliged to dismiss 1,200 agents. At that time we rejoiced at the triumph won for good government by the new laws, as exhibited in this effect, and congratulated the State on the complete success of its policy of repression.

It now appears, however, that our expressions of gratification were premature. Superintendent HOTCHKISS has examined the records and revealed the duplicity and the hideous fact that this company in reducing the number of its employees deliberately selected for sacrifice not the most useful members of its staff; not the agents who by special training, experience and aptitude for the work are of greatest value to it, but those who could be spared with the least injury to its organization and disturbance of its affairs. It dismissed the men whose disappearance from its force would produce the least bad results. The villainous conduct of the company is shown in figures by the superintendent:

"Our tabulation shows that 482 of the dismissed agents, or 39 per cent., wrote no business at all, either last year or this; 229 wrote but one policy and 139 but two policies. Thus 850, or upward of 68 per cent. of the total, wrote not more than two policies each, while but 51, that is about 4 per cent., wrote more than ten policies."

Obviously, these were not the most important agents. Many of them were beginners, part time men, enterprising chaps carrying life insurance as a side line:

"These figures suggest the claim that a large number of men were deprived of their means of livelihood by the action of this company is rather wide of the mark. Clearly most of them were part time men of extremely limited productivity and whose commission income was very small. The average business written in fifteen months by each of the agents whose services were dispensed with was but $4,213."

There is almost a note of regret in Mr. HOTCHKISS'S grieved declaration that no "large number" of these dismissed agents "were deprived of their means of livelihood." Indeed his opinion seems to be that it would have been a proper cause of joyous congratulation had the operation of the law caused a majority of the 1,223 men to go a-begging for bread, and that disappointment must be felt that such a result was not brought about.

This is only a detail. Our own complaint is that the company perfidiously and obstinately attempts to comply with the law by methods damaging itself as little as may be, seeks to preserve an agency force built up by years of toil and effort, and refuses most contumaciously to destroy itself utterly in obedience to the inspired regulations of CHARLES E. HUGHES.

The Taxpayer or the Tiger?

On the third Tuesday in August a great local convulsion is to occur in Charleston, the ancient metropolis of South Carolina. It is not the kind of convulsion that would have been possible there a hundred years ago, when fops and bucks paraded on the battery and ladies wore powder and patches and cried Oh, la! upon the smallest provocation, and swords flashed in the air at the sudden movement of an eyebrow. It is a plain, sordid, every day modern struggle over whiskey, whether it shall be sold open and legally in the dispensaries and thereby give to Charleston a revenue of about $140,000, or whether it shall be sold surreptitiously by illicit methods in blind tigers or by bootleggers or otherwise. If the wets win the dispensation of liquor will be properly restricted and regulated. In the other event whiskey will be vended in cellars or alleys or around the corner in dark places; and Charleston, none too rich in revenue as things are, will be out of pocket to the tune of at least $140,000 annually.

It will be a momentous occasion in the history of the town. As a corporation Charleston is very poor, for it maintains more charities than any city twice its size that we know of. No one doubts that the usual amount of liquor will be consumed there whichever way the election goes. There is no power to keep it out or to prevent its consumption when it gets there. Moreover, all laws fail where public sentiment holds them in contempt and execration. To a very great extent the finances of Charleston are at stake, to say nothing of its morality, and next month's balloting will mean more for the corporation than can be told in a brief review, or understood, if told, by the average outsider.

Deacon HEMPHILL, as usual, is shouting on the battle line, and, again as usual, he shouts good common sense: "Don't forget that the issue is not the issue of temperance or prohibition, but the issue of liquor sold under wise regulations and restrictions or liquor sold by the illicit dealers for their own individual profit. The issue is: The Taxpayer or the Tiger!"

We have received from an anonymous correspondent one dollar, described as "one day's reprieve for a victim of man's ingratitude," the "victim" being Joe, the oldest fire horse in Hoboken. The best use to which the money can be put seems to be the assistance of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in Hoboken, and it will be forwarded to the organization.

Saturday Half Holiday.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Government employees in this city have long been pleading for an increase in salary sufficient to enable them to live decently in a great city where the cost of living absorbs the revenues. At last the increase has come, an increase of hours from 12 o'clock until 1 on Saturdays. As "time is money" this is really an increase.

Is it right for the Government to ask for this additional hour after noon on Saturday? Are not its employees entitled to that which the State law gives them, a half holiday on Saturdays? They receive by State law holidays on Labor Day and now another on Columbus Day. It seems to me the Government has no moral or legal right to ask its employees in this State to work after 12 o'clock noon on Saturdays. My observation is that the Government gains nothing by exacting the extra hour. The work is done at 12 o'clock and the employees spend the remaining hour in cursing the power that has changed the rule. M.

NEW YORK, July 9.

The National Guard's Signal Corps.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your account this morning of the forthcoming manœuvres of the militia in Massachusetts made no mention of the part the Signal Corps will play in both the attack and the defence. In fact the press generally seems of late to have got the impression that the army signal service is a sort of detached body for experiment in wireless telegraphy and in ballooning, whereas its duties aside from these are manifold and of the greatest importance and interest.

The Signal Corps of the National Guard of New York has been ordered out for duty next month in the attack upon the Massachusetts coast, and will play a part which it will be well worth your while to observe, aside from the spectacular movements of the troops themselves.

S. M. HAYWARD,
First Company, Signal Corps, N. G. N. Y.

NEW YORK, July 9.

The French Triad.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In the editorial in THE SUN of July 8, "The Joiner Nation," "fraternity" is hailed as the ruling American spirit. Why not hail the watchword of the French Revolutionists: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," as the ruling American passions?

Lincoln, one of the greatest statesmen that ever lived, declared in his famous Gettysburg address that this is a nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

The Declaration of Independence itself declares that all men are created equal.

These two passions, liberty and equality, seem far more the ruling passions of America than fraternity. Although fraternity has a dominating power in America it is subordinate to liberty and equality. ROSCOE W. ROSS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 8.

King Arthur's Round Table.

From the London Evening Standard.

Although the work of excavating the Roman amphitheatre popularly known as King Arthur's Round Table at Caerleon, Monmouthshire, has only been in progress a few days, some very interesting discoveries have been made. The most striking undoubtedly is that of the two piers of the southern gateway through which the chariots passed into the arena.

The gateway is nine feet six inches in width, and the walls are of characteristic Roman work, with massive stones still looking as if they would last for centuries. From the upper to the lower wall must have stretched beams of wood or connecting walls on which sloping lines of seats were built, there being room, it is estimated, for eleven tiers, giving seating capacity for between 4,000 and 5,000 spectators.

For the Relief of Mr. Curtis.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Come to think on't, I b'lieve Mr. Emerson said "I'd."

NEW YORK, July 9. JOHN H. CLIFFORD.

Accomplishments of Cerberus.

Pluto was boasting of his three headed dog. "The little darling can keep more people awake by barking than any other pup on the block!" he cried.

ART NOTES.

It was an excellent idea of Mr. William T. Evans to lend some of his pictures by American artists to the National Arts Club, 119 East Nineteenth street, for exhibition during the remaining summer months. These galleries are cool, if not luminous, and if the paintings are hung higgledy-piggledy we must not be too critical with the thermometer above the normal. There are nearly fifty examples on view, twenty of them by Will H. Low—the original designs for the decoration of the Waldorf-Astoria ballroom. The other artists represented are: Waugh, Fuller, Carlsen, the late J. H. Twachtman, the late Theodore Robinson, Robert Reid, J. Alden Weir, Metcalf, Church, Hassam, Dewey and Lawson. Some of these pictures are to be given to the National Gallery, Washington. They have all been on exhibition in this city.

We wish to call particular attention to the Twachtmans. This artist, who was the pioneer of the impressionistic school in America, is well represented, from "The White Bridge" to the "Fishing Boats at Gloucester," from evanescent flowers in the meadows to the old "Holly House" in winter time. There are none of his iridescent waterfalls, yet the range of his styles and their various modifications are fairly set forth. Theodore Robinson, notwithstanding the influence of Monet, with whom he painted at Giverny, was individual. There are four of his paintings on view. Ernest Lawson's "The Swimming Hole" was shown here season before last. It is a rich bit of color, of a pattern both significant and decorative, while the canvas is charged with the sentiment of outdoors, with poetic feeling; a genuine Lawson. Mr. Reid's "The Brown Veil" and "The Green Door" are old favorites. "The South Strand" by Emil Carlsen was exhibited last winter. It is cool in coloring though not cold. The spirit of the sea saturates the picture. Waugh's massive seas, tumbling and thundering in giant masses, reveal the close grip this painter has on actuality. His marines are always powerful. Winslow Homer and Paul Dougherty are among the few other American artists who display so sure a sense of the rhythmic combat of wind, wave and coast. C. M. Dewey's "Gray Day in Shropshire" is charming; so is Willard Metcalf's "The Bower," which we have praised before. Nor is there need to describe F. S. Church's "Una and the Lion," or Childe Hassam's "Isle of Shoals." Both are well known, well liked works. Mr. Fuller's large symbolic "Illusions" and the Low designs complete a very enjoyable summer exhibition. Admission is free.

The gentle art of irony as expressed in design is so rare nowadays that when we encounter it we are bound to pause. A special instance may be found in the spring number of the *Butterfly*, published in Philadelphia and conducted by George Wolfe Plank. This gentleman is also the art editor and the illustrator of the cuts in question. Mr. Plank, we believe, has a pretty taste in making book plates; but his work was unknown to us until the four designs illustrating a poem by Julia A. Moore, better known as "The Sweet Singer of Michigan," appeared. This poet has written a "sentimental song" entitled "Carrie Munro," and Mr. Plank has drawn what he subtly calls "sentimental woodcuts" for it. The first is excellent, though not the equal of its companions. The artist has revived the old fashioned woodcut, simple almost to crudity in the execution, yet suggesting that he has studied both Bewick and William Blake; were it not for the comic angel twanging the banjo in the fourth plate, the tree mass and sky spacing would be Blakesque; but the restrained satire—irony is the better word—of these woodcuts is inimitable. Unless this artist can keep up the pace he has set for himself he has, as Heine would say, a future behind him.

You may have forgotten—though that is an incredible idea—the song called "Carrie Munro." It begins thus; admire its sweet sonorities:

Once there was a lady fair, with black eyes and
curly hair.

The chorus runs:

Sweet Carrie Munro, dear Carrie Munro, and her
friends will not forget sweet Carrie Munro.

Not Holley Chivers, no, not even Alfred Austin, could have compassed such pristine crystalline simplicity. Mr. Plank shows us Carrie as a posterlike lady with a lackadaisical air, limply folded hands, neck slightly askew, and a bonnet that would have pleased Aubrey Beardsley. Such a sentimental headgear, early Victorian ribbons and all! A sheer delight, Carrie Munro, we hope you have not forgotten, married a worthy man, but she died, nevertheless. Just before her spirit "fled," sings her poet, she spoke. "Prove faithful, Birdie, to me," said sweet Carrie Munro. The bed, the pillow upon which lies the lady, the crown of bliss swimming in the air above her, her weeping husband, his handkerchief designed in that peculiarly wooden, formal style of certain old time hymn books and albums dear to sentimental folk, are lovely in conception. You will find it difficult to keep a straight face when contemplating the portrait of "Birdie," otherwise the bereaved husband; or the simulacrum of the departed one on "the other shore." Mr. Plank has the true *vis comica*, the note is unforced; but we are loath to believe that he will ever excel these clever illustrations. Besides, where will he ever find such appropriate verse, suffused with pathos, upon which to wreak his subacid and delicate humor!

HUMANICULTURE AT SEATTLE.

A Broadway Lamb in the Pastures of the Pacific Slope.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The stray lamb from the Broadway fold once more bobs up serenely. I am now sitting down and taking notice of the world's most beautiful exposition in Seattle. Men who have been to London and Paris say so, and it must be true.

It would make the heart of THE SUN warm with renewed glow and brilliancy to see the New York building. It is a replica of the Seward home. All roads lead to the New York building. Even Chicago had to be entertained there. The Windy City did not provide a building of its own. Seattle is the eighth wonder of the world. They are already talking about the commercial commander of the Pacific as the third city in the United States in 1915.

First—New York.
Second—Chicago.
Third—Seattle.

Mark my words, Seattle will make good. The famous Seattle spirit is the faith which removes mountains and does the impossible. They are literally removing mountains in Seattle and using the waste dirt to fill up hollows and make beautiful boulevards. In Seattle they are studying humaniculture, too. They are more interested in producing fine men and women than they are in producing fine horses and apples. The men and women dress as well as they do in New York.

Seward is regarded as the father of Alaska as much as Houston of Tennessee is regarded as the father of Texas and Washington of the United States.

Seward, who said "Let's sign the treaty to-night," and Alaska passed from Russia to the United States for $7,200,000. Already Alaska has sent to Seattle, which is in the State of Washington, over $300,000,000 in gold, coal and rich agricultural products, and more coming every day.

LOUIS G. MUNFORD.

SEATTLE, July 4.

THE DIRECT TAX AMENDMENT.

The Federal Constitution can be amended in two ways, and only in those two ways. There are prescribed agencies to propose amendments, and other prescribed agencies to adopt them and make them a part of the Constitution. No other agencies can propose or adopt.

The two houses of Congress can by a two-thirds vote of each propose amendments, and so can a convention of all the States called by Congress on the application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States.

The Senate has recently selected the first method of proposal of the income tax amendment.

The two agencies for adopting proposals amending the Constitution are the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode may be set forth by Congress.

The Senate has recently voted for the first mode, and the State Legislatures are to ratify or refuse to ratify.

Heretofore all amendments have by Congress been proposed to State Legislatures; none to State conventions.

President Taft wrote to Congress a few days ago to the effect that a majority of the people if voting in the mass would probably ratify the income tax amendment that he proposed to Congress; but the Constitution does not permit a majority voting as a collective people to have anything to do with amendments. It is three-fourths of the States that alone can ratify, and that fact should have a lesson for nationalists.

The State Legislatures must accept or reject the very words that Congress has proposed.

One-fourth of the States must submit to three-fourths, excepting that "no State without its consent shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

Up to 1808 no amendment could affect the "direct tax" clause which it is now proposed by the Senate to affect.

Thus it will be seen that even three-fourths of the other States cannot prostrate the sovereignty or destroy the autonomy in the Senate of little States like Rhode Island—which, Senator Bailey was polite enough to say in the Senate a few days ago, many people wish had never ratified the Constitution—or Delaware.

If the income tax resolution shall be concurred in by a two-thirds vote of the House the Governor of New York will inform the Legislature and it will ratify or reject.

Mr. Taft on Diplomatic Intercourse With the Vatican.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* President Taft is reported to have said at Plattsburg:

Fifty years ago if it had been proposed to send a representative of the Government to the Vatican to negotiate and settle matters arising in a country like the Philippines between the Government and the Roman Catholic Church it would have given rise to the severest condemnation and criticism on the part of those who would have feared some diplomatic connection between the Government and the Vatican contrary to our traditions; but within the last ten years that has been done with the full concurrence of all religious denominations, believing that the way to do things is to do them directly, and when a matter is to be settled that it should be settled with the head of the Church, who has authority to act.

And so it fell to my lot, my dear friends, and in that respect just by good luck came to be an exception which will perhaps stand for many years as the sole exception, of being a representative of the United States at the Vatican. There I had the great pleasure of meeting that distinguished statesman and pontiff Leo XIII., a man of 92, whom I expected to find rather a lay figure, directed by the councils of the Cardinals, than one active in control of the Church.

If Mr. Taft intended that the United States has never maintained diplomatic relations with the Pope and diplomatic as well as consular representatives at the Vatican he blundered.

When, as for many years, the Pope was the only temporal sovereign of the Papal States, and at Rome, with whom else could the United States have diplomatic relations? Without going further back it will be enough to say that in 1848 Congress appropriated money for diplomatic intercourse with the Pope and diplomatic agents were sent.

As late as 1866 Mr. King was our Minister to the Pope, and Secretary Seward gave instructions to him regarding an American ship of war at Civita Vecchia as the 'Cardinal Secretary of State desired.

DIPLOMATIC HISTORY.

NEW YORK, July 9.

Union League Club Opinion of Senator Root's Course.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It is difficult of explanation, almost weird, that the junior Senator from New York should sit in his seat complacently and on roll calls acquiesce in measures inimical to corporations.

There is a tinge of mystery surrounding Mr. Root's present attitude toward corporate legislation which doesn't suggest the Elihu Root of the old days.

Elihu Root, of all men, calmly looking on while combinations of capital whose representative he is supposed to be are ruthlessly attacked legislatively, and not even a suggestion of anguish depicted in his countenance!

In fact, quite the reverse, he seems to bask in a condition of mingled joy and patriotism at their discomfiture.

From the corporation point of view the Hon. Elihu Root is either an indolent Senator or else a good actor. A. B. H.

UNION LEAGUE CLUB, July 8.

English Spoken Here.

From the City Record.

Appointing the following named persons assistant teachers of physical training:

Jacob Goldman, Louis Monash, Jeannette E. Greenstein, Samuel Koplik, David H. Perlman, Elsie E. Adler, Abner H. Pike, Russell L. Ray, Henrietta Miodowsick, Saul Schlegman, William E. Hansberry, Jr., Frances H. Moskowitz, Joseph Schroff, Irving N. Beck, Mary E. Nolan, Maxwell A. Crooke, William Hochhauser, Kate F. O'Connor, Isador Bernstein, Meyer M. Jacobs, Louise E. Siebert, Louis Brand, Harry Landesman, Ettie Thomas, Isidore M. Brenner, Samuel A. Moss, Anna Ungerleider, Isidore L. Cohen, Jonathan Perlmutter, Catherine E. Fallon, Abram Ginsburg, Bernard J. Schneeweiss, Grace K. Hynes, Herman Golden, David E. Schimmel, Gretchen Schuh, Max Lazarus, Evelyn Billings, Jessie E. Wilcox, Paul H. Reichardt, Josephine Hiesel, Sarah Morris, Louis B. Spivak, Margaret L. Iwanowitz, Hilda Dunbar, Charles Conn, Euphemia Shearer, Alicia M. Kennedy, Benedict Fox, Arline H. Terrington, Elizabeth P. Murray, Clifton Norman, Helen I. Veith, Anna Newman, Nathan Salwen, Marjorie Weirich, Margaret Roggerman, Samuel Schiff, Marie Brady, Marion I. Weeks, Abraham Brill, Irene A. Fallon, Mary Murphy, Samuel A. Fried, Ella E. Kollock, Mary F. Cassidy, Aloysius Gillick, Helen Lindgren, Alice M. E. Tucker, Joseph Kling, Helene S. McLaughlin, May C. Fay, Abraham Barbanell, Lily Schneppe, Minnie Flaum, Emanuel Celler, Harriett B. Trusdell, Mary A. Gibson, Abraham Ehrenfeld, Laura F. Wickham, Aida M. Goldstein, Charles L. Frank, Maud V. Whitney, Sophie R. King, Philip M. Friedman, Dorothea Zweifach, Annie Mayer, Philip Korn, Margaret Askanazy, May E. Townsend, Samuel Litwin, Beulah M. Covert.

No Danger From the Invaders.

From Le Cri de Paris.

Premier Clemenceau is incorrigible. He recently visited the Maritime Alps. From a height he was looking out over a vast panorama. A young official who had posted himself from his Baedeker called the attention of M. Clemenceau to the picturesque arrangement of the villages. "These villages," said the young man, "have been thus constructed to defend these gorges against the invasion of the Saracens."

M. Clemenceau responded calmly: "Ah, and they have succeeded. I do not see a single Saracen."

BLIND BOSTON.

The Shame of Plymouth Is a Bay State Boast.

From the Boston Advertiser.

With a column surcharged with conflicting emotions of hate, envy, malice and wickedness, THE SUN again proceeds to bombard Plymouth Rock.

"Plymouth Rock shall be restored!" cries our contemporary, with the shrill shriek of a steam siren. "Restored"? It was restored, many years ago; restored to a fit setting, restored to the care of those who love it best, restored to the sight of hundreds of thousands of Pilgrims who have come from distant lands to view the treasure in its appropriate surroundings. What THE SUN really wishes is not that it shall be "restored" but that it shall be robbed; robbed of its noble simplicity, robbed perhaps of its present fitting location; robbed of its traditions, it may be, and robbed of all that makes it so attractive to the world and especially to the patriotic American citizens who love it.

Judging from the experience of New York THE SUN would like the historic Rock leased out to contractors with full permission to blast it into structural or road material, as the glorious historic Palisades have been. Or possibly THE SUN wishes the Rock to be plastered with advertisement after the fashion of that wonderful relic the New York subway. Or perhaps THE SUN would like to have the Rock tucked away in a safety deposit vault and protected by rules which would give no outsider a "look in," as in the case of the once famous America's cup. Or it may be that THE SUN would like to have Plymouth Rock put in a "park" after the fashion of the New York city parks—which need no further description than a comparison with the straggly fringe of hair around an otherwise bald cranium. "Restored"? Not by any method which New York uses, thank you!

THE SUN'S demand for the restoration of Plymouth Rock recalls the story of the fair haired, ingenuous boy who asked his mother: "Ma, was that hair restorer in the bottle on the bathroom shelf?" And when the doting parent replied that it was not hair restorer but liquid glue, "Then, I guess," the boy thoughtfully remarked, "you will have some trouble in combing baby's hair for the next few weeks." We want no impious New Yorkers attempting to "restore" our sacred relic of our forefathers. Meanwhile most of such relics that formerly existed in New York are beyond restoring. The inhabitant of Manhattan could never understand the pure and noble sentiment which has led the people of this city, for example, to preserve the old State House, or such churches as the Old South or the Dorchester Meeting House, or Christ Church or King's Chapel; or to save the Paul Revere house, or the many other Boston reminders of the glorious past. In New York they would have been "restored" out of existence fifty years ago.

THE CARE OF COWS.

Closely Confined Now, as Compared With a Generation Ago.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I read with interest what eminent physicians say about the increase in tuberculosis and milk. Having been raised on a farm I took a trip recently through the milk producing country and have decided that closer confinement of cows as compared with the practice of thirty-five years ago is the cause of this disease. It is most strange that cows affected with this disease do not show it in any visible way.

Thirty-five years ago our cows were kept in comfortable stables through the winter, and about 9 o'clock A. M. were let out and yarded until 4 o'clock P. M., about seven hours in the yard. To-day a trip up the Unadilla or Susquehanna Valley will show distinctly the change in keeping cows. First results are looked for. You will find large underground barns with stables warm as our home rooms, with fifty to seventy-five cows kept up in beautiful shape. These cows are let out of the stable just long enough to drink, and put back immediately and fed with all the feed they can possibly stand. With zero weather outside the stables are very warm.

If one cow has tuberculosis, what hinders the others from being affected shortly by breathing this warm air and inhaling each other's breath? While the farmer gets the best results in this way of farming, he certainly cannot avoid trouble in his dairy, and this close confinement is the direct cause of tuberculosis in the dairies of to-day.

CARBONDALE, Pa., July 8. F. T.

THE TORTURE OF CLOTHES.

A Courageous Reformer Who Has Discarded Underwear in Summer.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I suppose no two instruments of torture have ever produced so much suffering in hot climates as the undershirt and drawers. Some years ago manufacturers of underwear began to make summer undershirts without sleeves. After wearing this kind for several years it occurred to me that if the absence of sleeves made so much difference in my comfort I had better leave the whole thing off. From that time on I ceased to dread hot weather so far as the upper part of my body was concerned, but we are such creatures of habit that two more years passed before I plucked up enough courage to emancipate myself from the nether garment. Now I am clad in a single layer. Hot weather no longer has any terrors for me; indeed, I enjoy hot days quite as much as cool days.

I have discovered it is the double layer that causes the suffering. It makes no difference how thin the layers are, the effect is the same. Underclothing as thin as a cobweb will cause almost if not quite as much discomfort as the thicker kinds.

Delighted with my discovery and revelling in the comfort it afforded me I naturally sought to impart its benefit to others; but I soon found that the wearing of underclothing is regarded by most people as if it were a sort of religious obligation, and my advice was generally received with a species of horror. Most of those to whom I spoke said they could not possibly do without underclothing, for it was necessary to absorb the perspiration, and the kind they wore was so thin that it made no difference anyway. Almost all turned a deaf ear to my assurance that if they would only try it for a day they would find there would be no need to absorb perspiration, for what little there was would evaporate fast enough to keep them cool.

High and low, rich and poor, all alike are slaves to this superstition and appear to prefer suffering rather than discard one of the envelopes in which they swathe themselves.

Now, after my experience, I have of course no notion that any great number of people will adopt my suggestion, but I am sure that the few who do so will rise up and call me blessed.

NEW YORK, July 9. ERNEST FLAGG.

The Law of Standing By.

From Law Notes for July.

Newspapers have reported in the last few months many instances where an automobile struck a pedestrian or a vehicle, inflicting serious or fatal personal injuries, and instantly sped onward so that the machine or its driver was not identified. Legislatures can do something to discourage that practice by enacting a statute similar to the act of Congress of September 4, 1890, c. 875, 2 Fed. Stat. Annot., p. 202, which requires that the master or person in charge of a vessel in collision with another shall, "so far as he can do so without serious danger," &c., "stay by the other vessel," render assistance if needed, "give the name of his vessel and her port of registry," &c., and provides that "if he fails to do so, and no reasonable cause for such failure is shown, the collision shall, in the absence of proof to the contrary, be deemed to have been caused by his wrongful act, neglect or default." Even without such a statute, however, the conduct thus denounced would probably be treated by a Judge or jury as a *prima facie* confession of dereliction. But the act of Congress also imposes "a penalty of $1,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years" for violation of the provisions above quoted.

A Doubting Nebraskan.

From the North Loup Loyalist.

Vol Earnest says he has worked some this summer in spite of all reports to the contrary. We usually believe all he tells us, but in this matter we are "from Missouri."

An Argive Cowherd.

Argus was boasting of his hundred eyes.

"Think of putting on fifty pairs of goggles when you want to motor!" we cried.