

The Sun

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1910.

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

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month, \$3.00

WEEKLY, Per Year, \$30.00

ADVERTISING, Per Line, 10 Cents

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

ADVERTISING, Per Page, \$5.00

ADVERTISING, Per Month, \$15.00

ADVERTISING, Per Year, \$150.00

ADVERTISING, Per Column, \$1.00

visers," inserted in the carefully prepared and formal announcement of the Cabinet's plan of action, implies a difference of views between the sovereign and the Government which the British Constitution, as interpreted for a century past, does not admit to be possible. It suggests that a revival of the latent rights of the third partner in Parliament may have to be considered.

About the differences between the Houses there is common agreement as to principles; opinions vary only as to definitions and limitations. Nobody has denied the absolute power of the House of Commons over finance; the budget was rejected by the Lords on the ground that other legislation was tacked on or involved in the money bill. The "predominance" of the Commons in legislation, unless the word is made to mean "sole power," is a matter of established fact that will continue so long as it retains the initiative.

The action, from which the Crown seems to withhold its approval before it is proposed even, is apparently the transformation of the House of Lords into an active Second Chamber, for whatever the grammatical construction of "this House," in the extraordinary blunder that was allowed to slip into an important state paper, the sense dears its applying to the Commons. It is to be constituted and empowered to exercise functions "impartially," which suggests the suppression of the Conservative preponderance of votes. Its functions, on the other hand, are to be enlarged so as to include "initiation, revision and, subject to proper safeguards, delay," in other words the right to introduce bills, to amend them, and, within limits, to reject them. This means a change in British government serious enough to rise above party. Will Mr. ASQUITH confer with the Conservatives before introducing his bill?

In hinting disapproval in the speech from the throne, in place of the regular precedent of calling the leader of the opposition to form a new Ministry, the King indicates that he, as well as Mr. ASQUITH and Mr. BALFOUR, is disinclined to dissolve the Parliament and hopes for no practical change from a new election. Moderation that will insure the acquiescence of the Conservatives seems to be the only policy at present for Mr. ASQUITH if his Cabinet is to remain in power.

Let Us Hear From President Taft. At the meeting in Carnegie Hall on Sunday afternoon, called at the instance of Admiral SIGSBEE to remember the Maine by raising a monument to her dead, the Hon. JOSEPH H. CHAPPEL, a giant in any cause, threw his influence into the scale for the raising of the Maine.

As I sailed into the harbor of Havana a year ago I was sadly impressed with the spectacle of the Maine and with the thought that that is the only monument to its victims. It is not our credit that it remains there, to obstruct commerce and stand as a reminder of our neglect. I think that the association of which Admiral SIGSBEE is president should receive the support of all Americans.

It seemed to be the sense of the meeting that while a public subscription to raise a monument to the Maine dead was commendable, it was first of all the duty of the Government to raise the Maine. A resolution proposed by Commander MAURICE SIMMONS of the New York Department of the United Spanish War Veterans calling upon Congress to enact legislation for the removal of the wreck was adopted with unmistakable earnestness by an audience of 3,000 persons, which included not only many veterans of the war but a number of survivors of the disaster. "What restrains us from raising the Maine?" asked some one in the audience when Representative SULZER was speaking. "I have been often asked why Congress refuses to pass the bill," was the reply; "it can only say I do not know." Admiral SIGSBEE, who a year ago seemed to be opposed to raising the Maine, but was converted, we hope, by the demonstration on Sunday, himself said in a lecture in Washington that he did not know "the Government's view." No one has penetrated the mystery. It is charitable to suppose that Congress has been apathetic, not antipathetic.

It was in May last that Admiral SIGSBEE disclaimed knowledge of the Government's attitude. In the previous January the Provisional Governor of Cuba, Mr. MAGOON, in making his last report drew attention to the fact that the Cuban Government "would gladly afford every assistance in its power" to have the wreck removed because it lay in a portion of the best anchorage in the harbor "at the point where the channel entrance makes a sharp turn" and had caused a shoal so extensive that "the entire harbor is rapidly filling." His recommendation that the wreck be removed was endorsed in a message to Congress on January 27 by President ROOSEVELT, who asked that an appropriation be made for the purpose.

Let us hear from Mr. TAFT. It has been reported that he desires to see the Maine raised. He will receive a copy of the resolution of the Carnegie Hall meeting, as will every Senator and Representative. Congress has disregarded the urgings of poets of Spanish War Veterans all over the country. It has allowed a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine to lie on the table without action. But when popular meetings speak their will the time is auspicious for President TAFT to address Congress on the subject and for Congress to respond as a representative body with the enabling appropriation.

After Connors Who? Wherein is the Democratic party to profit if MURPHY ejects CONNORS from the chairmanship of the State committee and puts in the vacant place a man more nearly after his own heart? MURPHY's recent course in politics has not been such as to recommend him to "practical" politicians, and a famous led State committee will not appeal to the patriotism of independent voters in the urban or the rural districts. Indeed nothing can be imagined more cheering to the now despondent Republicans than would be the ac-

knowledge by the Democrats that their organization is controlled by the Fourteenth Street Wigwam.

To get rid of CONNORS would be a highly desirable thing if it meant the introduction of a new and strong man commanding general respect and possessing the confidence of the voters. But if getting rid of CONNORS simply means that he and MURPHY are at odds and that MURPHY has a majority of the committee, how is the party to be strengthened by the change?

Is there no able, intelligent and unselfish Democrat left in New York State capable of taking advantage of the opportunities that the Republicans throw in his party's way?

The "Specialist" in Wall Street. Bills introduced in the State Legislature seeking to accomplish reforms of alleged "abuses" in stock exchange transactions are often mere strike measures. Again, they sometimes betray on the part of their authors a lamentable ignorance of the proper and necessary conditions attendant upon dealings in securities. It is a pleasure to be able to draw attention to one bill relating to Wall Street business to which such objections cannot be made. If the principle of this measure could be enacted or made effective by the stock exchange authorities themselves through their own regulations the result would be a great improvement in the conduct of these operations.

The bill we are speaking of is offered by Assemblyman CLARKE of Kings county. It defines as a conspiracy and punishes either as petty larceny or as grand larceny, according to the amount of money involved, the act of a member of a stock exchange who while acting as a specialist in any stock takes for his own account or gives to any other person to take for his account stock for the purchase or sale of which orders have been placed in his, the specialist's, hands for execution.

It may be that the bill as drawn is not entirely flawless, and it is to be considered whether according to a strict legal interpretation the proposed law would be constitutional, but the end sought to be attained is nevertheless entirely praiseworthy. For the benefit of those not thoroughly versed in stock exchange terminology it should perhaps be explained that a "specialist" is a broker who makes a practice of dealing, oftentimes exclusively, in various particular stocks. Known as a specialist in certain stocks, orders for the purchase and sale of these are placed with him by other brokers, so that in the case of a great number of inactive stocks the origin of the daily bid and asked quotations therefor is generally confined to the specialists. No doubt this arrangement facilitates dealings, but it is clear that the process invests the specialists with great power and places in their hands a temptation to operate for their own account in the stock concerned, which may result injuriously to the customers of other stock exchange houses who desire to buy or sell it.

A specialist who has orders for the purchase of a large amount of a given stock at a price under the ruling market, and orders likewise for the sale of the same stock at prices above the market, is enabled to trade for himself in this stock in a very advantageous way. Instances are not at all uncommon where the specialists in such private operations have slaughtered in a selfish and morally indefensible way orders for the purchase and sale of stocks coming from the general public, but reaching the specialists through the medium of other members of the stock exchange. According to an honorable code of ethics the specialist ought to act in the matter as a trustee, and the market for a stock which he reports ought to be a fair and open market and not one which proceeds from himself.

The reform intended by Mr. CLARKE's bill might be made effective without legislation at Albany by means of a regulation prohibiting members of the exchange from buying or selling stocks up or to a specialist when he "gives up" himself personally as the principal in the transaction. This limitation, of course, would apply only to those stocks which are the specialty of the broker in question. It might, as has been said, be found difficult to enforce all this by statute, but a suggestion of decided value is herein made to the governors of the stock exchange.

There seems to be no reason, moreover, why another rule should not be adopted by the stock exchange governors requiring a broker when publicly offering on the floor of the exchange to buy or sell a block of stock at a given price to sell or to buy any component part of this block at the same price. As the rule now stands a broker making an offer of the sort described is only compelled to take or sell the stock when the resulting bid or offer made to him by another broker is for the entire block designated.

The present practice is responsible for a good share of that manipulation in securities for which the stock exchange as a body and as regards its transactions in the mass has been often most unjustly and severely blamed.

The Rising of Indiana. Those of us who love Hoosier literature and look upon Indianapolis and Alamo as the twin capitals of the modern mind will be refreshed as by a cool wind by this declaration of independence emitted by our never enough to be esteemed contemporary the Courier of Lafayette on the Wabash and in Tippecanoe county:

"Why should high school pupils be required to study such insane and insipid stuff as HAYTHORN'S 'Twice Told Tales,' or such gibberish as CHAMBER'S 'Carter's Tales,' or such dippy trash as 'The Rime of the Ancient Mariner'?" Fossils tumble in a faint of indignation. Meek slaves of authority and tradition stare and gasp. The scabbard has been thrown away. Henceforth war without quarter and without truce will be crimson against all the old figureheads, all the major gods in possession, all the venerable chosen, blameless prizemen of letters. The "feudal"

musty books must be torn up. The bones of SHAKESPEARE shall be honored no more. To repeat the ancient question, "Whaur's WULLY SHAKESPEARE noo?" Indiana, fresh as her Grand Young Man, unflinching as her Wabash, original as her SHANK, has seceded from the empire of letters and will do business on her own hook.

We look for the passage of a statute forbidding the use of other than Indiana literature in Indiana reading books, libraries and bridge and culture clubs.

From habit and romantic tradition the United States continues to pay unstinted homage to GEORGE WASHINGTON. If he were a living man to-day, with all his imperfections on his head, a plutocrat, no handshaker, no friend to rash changes in the American polity, no trimmer to the popular gale, could be elected President?

Dr. FREDERICK A. COOK arrived here to-day from Santiago, Chile, to be interviewed. —Despatch from Valparaiso. Why should any one want to interview him? We are doing fairly well, but there is lots to be done yet. —SPEAKER CANNON. So Mr. TAFT thinks.

Will New Jersey listen to the petition of Staten Island for drinking water or not? It has been shown that New Jersey is blessed with a supply of pure water beyond her utmost need for fifty years. In Staten Island water will soon become almost priceless unless there is relief. About the only water available is undrinkable, according to Commissioner THOMPSON, who says: "We are simply asking New Jersey to give us enough water to supply Staten Island until the new Catskill aqueduct is completed, which, it is expected, will be in five or six years, but not more than ten at the most. When this aqueduct is working we will gladly return to New Jersey the water it gave us to the State fountains that it needs it."

We have heard a good deal of New Jersey justice. May she not prove lacking in humanity. THE PUTNAM DIVISION. Unflattering Description of a Part of the New York Central Service. To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Long suffering commuters on the New York Central's Putnam division (one of the standing jokes of the city) are to be congratulated for planning to call a mass meeting as a result of the exasperating service that has been supplied during the last year or more.

The last straw was laid last Tuesday evening when a score of passengers were at the Park Hill station until 7:42 waiting for the arrival of the 7:18 train. Most of them were on their way to theatres in New York and considered themselves fortunate to reach their destination in time to see the beginning of the play. The attention of the Board of Health should certainly be called to the condition of the cars, the seats of which are covered with moisten plush of an antebellum variety. The cars are filthy and the matter of adhering to any sort of schedule has long since been abandoned. The South Yonkers Improvement Association will be asked to take this matter up with the Public Service Commission in the Second District at Albany, and we should like to see the association of which Mr. GARDNER is president should receive the support of all Americans.

It seemed to be the sense of the meeting that while a public subscription to raise a monument to the Maine dead was commendable, it was first of all the duty of the Government to raise the Maine. A resolution proposed by Commander MAURICE SIMMONS of the New York Department of the United Spanish War Veterans calling upon Congress to enact legislation for the removal of the wreck was adopted with unmistakable earnestness by an audience of 3,000 persons, which included not only many veterans of the war but a number of survivors of the disaster. "What restrains us from raising the Maine?" asked some one in the audience when Representative SULZER was speaking. "I have been often asked why Congress refuses to pass the bill," was the reply; "it can only say I do not know." Admiral SIGSBEE, who a year ago seemed to be opposed to raising the Maine, but was converted, we hope, by the demonstration on Sunday, himself said in a lecture in Washington that he did not know "the Government's view." No one has penetrated the mystery. It is charitable to suppose that Congress has been apathetic, not antipathetic.

It was in May last that Admiral SIGSBEE disclaimed knowledge of the Government's attitude. In the previous January the Provisional Governor of Cuba, Mr. MAGOON, in making his last report drew attention to the fact that the Cuban Government "would gladly afford every assistance in its power" to have the wreck removed because it lay in a portion of the best anchorage in the harbor "at the point where the channel entrance makes a sharp turn" and had caused a shoal so extensive that "the entire harbor is rapidly filling." His recommendation that the wreck be removed was endorsed in a message to Congress on January 27 by President ROOSEVELT, who asked that an appropriation be made for the purpose.

Let us hear from Mr. TAFT. It has been reported that he desires to see the Maine raised. He will receive a copy of the resolution of the Carnegie Hall meeting, as will every Senator and Representative. Congress has disregarded the urgings of poets of Spanish War Veterans all over the country. It has allowed a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine to lie on the table without action. But when popular meetings speak their will the time is auspicious for President TAFT to address Congress on the subject and for Congress to respond as a representative body with the enabling appropriation.

After Connors Who? Wherein is the Democratic party to profit if MURPHY ejects CONNORS from the chairmanship of the State committee and puts in the vacant place a man more nearly after his own heart? MURPHY's recent course in politics has not been such as to recommend him to "practical" politicians, and a famous led State committee will not appeal to the patriotism of independent voters in the urban or the rural districts. Indeed nothing can be imagined more cheering to the now despondent Republicans than would be the ac-

knowledge by the Democrats that their organization is controlled by the Fourteenth Street Wigwam.

To get rid of CONNORS would be a highly desirable thing if it meant the introduction of a new and strong man commanding general respect and possessing the confidence of the voters. But if getting rid of CONNORS simply means that he and MURPHY are at odds and that MURPHY has a majority of the committee, how is the party to be strengthened by the change?

Is there no able, intelligent and unselfish Democrat left in New York State capable of taking advantage of the opportunities that the Republicans throw in his party's way?

THE OHIO BLUNDER.

COLUMBUS, February 19.—A week ago, when the announcement was made in Ohio that President Taft had decided to interfere in the local political situation, there was an instant impression that a mistake had been made. To-day that impression has ripened to a conviction that the President has been led into a blunder not recently equalled in Ohio political history. A many sided blunder, this excursion appears, when analyzed by those familiar with the present situation in this State, but above all else a blunder that is inexplicable because it seems unnecessary. For to-day, as yesterday, the reason for the President's sudden entrance remains a mystery only partially solved by the familiar explanation contained in the words to be heard everywhere in Ohio, "Bad advice."

The first criticism naturally rests upon the fact that the local situation seemed to have no phase that should call for Presidential interference at all. No one for a moment connects President Taft with the disrepute of his party in Ohio at the moment. A political machine has broken down here, much as another has broken down in New York, with the crumbling there have been revealed disreputable doings of party leaders and party officials. A whole State has been stirred by disclosures notably reminiscent of those in New York. The inclination of the voter to punish the Republican party is patent and not wholly illogical, but it had no national significance until Mr. Taft gave it such by assuming the burdens of his party in the State.

If it was a blunder to enter the situation at all, however, it was hardly less a blunder to appoint a man who had no right to represent a party in a State which he had no right to represent in the local mind, at least, with the wrecking. As the prosecuting attorney of the State, the Hon. Wade H. Ellis saw and knew some portion of the evidence now being unfolded by legislative investigation. No one accuses him of having any share in the original or disreputable phases of the Republican administration; on the contrary his reputation for personal integrity is general. If they took place during his term of office, he did not prosecute or connive at them; he did not protest, as others did. In the public mind he is associated with a regime now universally execrated. It is obvious, then, how little there is in the selection of the Hon. Wade H. Ellis to represent the President in this affair which can commend itself to the people of Ohio in their present temper.

There is, however, an even graver phase to the blunder. President Taft has not merely made a political error; the personal mistake is quite as plain. At Dayton, when the preliminary discussion was over the talk turned upon the man to name to defeat the Hon. Judson Harmon. The name most frequently mentioned was that of the Hon. James R. Garfield. In Ohio the Hon. James R. Garfield is recognized as a foe, not a friend, of the President. He has openly championed Pinchot in the Pinchot-Ballinger incident. He has indicated and is expected to indicate still more clearly his break with the President in this matter. To nominate Garfield, then, is very far from a rejection of an incumbent of President Taft. The strength of Mr. Garfield in Ohio is not Taft but anti-Taft in his character.

It is not hard to demonstrate the actual meaning of the Garfield movement. The first argument produced for Garfield is that, if he is nominated for Governor of Ohio, ex-President Roosevelt will stump the State for him. The direction this movement takes, therefore, is very far from favorable to the President. The very nomination of Garfield in Ohio will be rather a rejection than an endorsement of the Taft Administration. This is now made a matter of real significance because the President has assumed the entire responsibility in the situation. It would have been noteworthy but not conclusive had he stayed out of the affair. But now it is bound to have its "Back from Ellis" significance nationally.

Yet the general belief to be found in this State to-day is that if Harmon can be beaten, Garfield is the one possible option. It is odd, with memories of the "Forker Campaign" and "Round a Tooth" tradition, to be told that the one vote in Garfield's career is his vote in the Legislature for the "Forker fifty years franchise bill." This bill, it seems, had an evil name that has not vanished. For it Garfield voted, wisely, not corruptly, every one agrees, yet the Democrats maintain this issue alone would suffice to defeat him. Granting this, however, even they agree that he is Harmon's most dangerous opponent among the possibilities now mentioned. But Garfield's strength, as a rejection of the national standard, lies in his championship of a man nominated from office by President Taft and in his association not with the present but the preceding national Administration.

The contradiction in the situation is therefore patent: the man now viewed as most available in the fight against Harmon is the man who has rejected Taft. Yet President Taft has come into the Ohio situation and declared that the next State election must be fought upon his national Administration. Hence the mere nomination of James R. Garfield must mean a direct rebuff to the President without regard to the returns on election day.

There are a dozen other reasons which may be cited in support of the conviction that a blunder has been made. It is not as a Democrat that the Hon. Judson Harmon is strong in Ohio to-day. It is as a public official who has exposed corruption, ended graft and warred upon dishonesty. Precisely the strength that Governor Hughes has in New York belongs to Governor Harmon in his own State. Yet in an off year, when only a State election is to be held, President Taft has told the people that they must defeat Harmon on national issues and at his direction. A Democratic President might with equal propriety and identical chance of success tell the voters of New York that Governor Hughes must be defeated for reasons of national Democratic moment if Governor Hughes had affirmed his willingness to accept a renomination and complete the housecleaning at Albany. The New York situation could then coincide exactly with the Ohio situation to-day.

To send a wheelhorse of a discredited machine to take charge of a party shaken by revelations of corruption and thievery, to demand that a Governor, Democratic, to be sure, but at the moment efficient and successful in pursuing Republican offenders, be defeated before his work is done and in spite of it, to insist that the party which was responsible for the present conditions be returned to power unpunished, this is what President Taft has asked of Ohio. He has asked it, moreover, simply as an endorsement of his own personal administration in Washington. He has based his whole claim on the assumption that Ohio is above all else loyal to him.

So far as one can judge in February of the Ohio feeling toward the President's action it is one of surprise and indignation. No one seems to know why he has come into the local affair. No one seems to regard as valid in the least his claim for special consideration at this time. It is agreed that there are at least two men who are stronger in Ohio than William H. Taft, and they are Theodore Roosevelt and Judson Harmon. In taking the field at this time President Taft has deliberately aided the supporters of both these men. He has helped Harmon now, and visibly; his help to the Roosevelt camp is less apparent now, but no less real and no less clearly recognized in Ohio. How he has helped the Hon. William H. Taft, however, Ohio does not know.

Anderson, the Guerrilla. Exceeding Even Quantrell in Ferocity. It is Said He Respected Women. To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Mr. Roberts Love in his letter to THE SUN of February 14 stated the case concerning Quantrell, the guerrilla, so fairly and in a manner that I do not think it necessary to add anything concerning him that further explanation is unnecessary; but