The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 1910.

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 of the Association, Edward P. Mitchell, 170 Nassau street. Treasurer of the Association, M. E. Lafian, 170 Nassau street. Secretary of the Association, S. S. Colles, 170 Nassau street.

London office, Effingham House, 1 Arundel street, Strand. The daily and Sunday Sun can be ordered in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, Carlton street (opposite Regent street). Paris Edition Agent, Lorenz, rue de Castiglione (Rivoli).

Paris office, 38 Avenue de l'Opéra. 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 51, Boulevard des Italiens, corner Rue Lafayette (Grand).

On leaving the city for the summer you may have THE SUN sent to you by mail at the regular subscription rates, addresses being changed as often as desired. Orders may be sent through any newsdealer or to the publication office.

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

Republican Candidates.

In the next Republican State convention it seems fair to forecast that three distinct factions, to a certain extent mutually hostile, will seek to control the nominations. In the convention of a party which on three successive occasions has accepted the dictations of a boss and twice at least a nominee hateful to the majority of the delegates, if not to a majority of the party enrolment, this is a novel prospect.

The three divisions of the Republican party of this State at the present time are the Hughes faction, made up of the politically surviving followers of the present Governor and his primary policies; the regular faction, which actually controls the party machinery and opposes the Hughes programme, and the more or less nebulous faction which has joined itself to the personal and political fortunes of Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Already each of the three groups has in some measure disclosed the list of candidates from which it desires that the next Governor should be selected. Thus the Hughes faction will probably carry to the convention the name of the Hon. CLARK WILLIAMS or that of the Hon. WILLIAM H. HOTCHKISS. Perhaps the Roosevelt choice will be made between the Hon. WILLIAM LOEB, the Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON, the Hon. WILLIAM S. BENNET and the Hon. HAMILTON FISH, although the present indications are that Mr. LOEB'S name has been dropped.

For various reasons it is less easy to indicate the field from which the regular or machine faction will choose. Its first interest necessarily lies not in the choice of its own candidate but in preventing the choice of any candidate presented by either the Hughes or Roosevelt faction, or by both united, who shall be committed to the direct primary legislation. Save for this limitation the regular faction is doubtless ready to accept any candidate whose availability is manifest. From this quarter the names of the Hon. JACOB GOULD SCHURMAN, the Hon. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER and the Hon. DAVID JAYNE HILL have already been suggested, names more indicative of the kind of man wanted than of any actual decision.

Of the three men whose names have been advanced by the Hughes faction the Hon. CLARK WILLIAMS has lately been most prominent, since it is generally agreed that he has in the largest measure the approval of the present Governor. Mr. WILLIAMS is purely and simply a product of the Hughes administration politically, since, as he frankly concedes, he never even attended a party primary before the Governor appointed him to office. Lacking in his chief's aggressiveness, the Hon. CLARK WILLIAMS has gained little actual prominence in the primary fight, but his record as Superintendent of Banks would commend him to the independent voter.

The strength of the Hon. WILLIAM H. HOTCHKISS rests upon his investigations into the fire insurance world recently. The discoveries there recalled in a mild way many similar disclosures in the life insurance investigations of the Hon. CHARLES EVANS HUGHES. Mr. HOTCHKISS has also been a vehement platform champion of direct primary. His nomination would be even more bitterly opposed by the regular faction which has viewed the Hon. CLARK WILLIAMS with somewhat mild disapproval, but whose hostility to HOTCHKISS is unmistakable.

The position of the Roosevelt following is of course entirely a question of the ultimate decision of Mr. ROOSEVELT himself. Of the four candidates who are believed to command a measure of his respect sufficient to earn an indorsement at least three, the Hon. WILLIAM LOEB, the Hon. WILLIAM S. BENNET and the Hon. HAMILTON FISH, are almost completely without political weight in State affairs at the present time, and any public mention that they may have recently had is due to their association with the Roosevelt issue at Washington rather than in this State. The Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON has earned a considerable measure of local praise in the sugar cases, but he too would inevitably owe his nomination entirely to a Roosevelt command rather than to any considerable strength with the delegates themselves.

The cases for President SCHURMAN and President HILL are different. Both are distinguished men widely known to the people of the State. Both are recognized as possessing the qualifications for public service which in the present City of Rest are most sought. Both, moreover, possess for the regular element in the State party the indispensable qualification which consists in an intelligent and decided objection to the Hughes direct primary panacea, an objection which both have publicly expressed. Each would appeal to the independent voter, because each represents a type of candidate removed alike from the ordinary run of office seekers and from the suspicion of being controlled by a boss.

In the next State convention it is entirely possible that the Roosevelt and Hughes factions may appear united; but such a coalition seems inevitably to call for a preliminary concession on the part of the Roosevelt faction in the shape of an agreement to accept a candidate aggressively favorable to the direct primary and a further pledge to work for a platform definitely committing the party to radical primary reform. Up to the present time, however, Mr. ROOSEVELT has indicated no great affection for radical primary reform, and the Cobb bill supported by him will not satisfy any considerable fraction of the Hughes faction.

In a sense the real fight in the convention will centre about the party platform. The nomination of WILLIAM H. HOTCHKISS would be an incident in the declaration for a sweeping reform. On the other hand the nomination of LOEB, STIMSON, FISH, BENNET or some other Roosevelt man would accompany a compromise with an eye to the main chance rather than the moral resolution and an effort to accept just enough moral regulation to carry the State. The extent to which real coalition between the Hughes and Roosevelt factions is actually possible is an interesting thing to watch.

The regular faction is naturally less definitely committed to any narrowed field of candidates. It is eager to nominate a candidate of high character, whose public service has been sufficient to earn him the respect of the independent as well as the party voter. Two such candidates are President BUTLER and President SCHURMAN. The candidate named, if the regular faction prevails, will measure up to this standard and will have no leanings toward any direct primary legislation.

Plans for the New Subways.

The public shares with the officers of the Interborough company the ignorance which President SHONTS confesses as to the details of the plans for projected subways which the Public Service Commission is now drawing. But Mr. SHONTS must be the victim of a wag in the information on which he bases the subjoined statement:

"I have been told that the plans provide for larger cars, larger tubes, larger everything, and if this is so, I say without hesitation that I think it is a mistake."

It is inconceivable that the Public Service Commission should contemplate so tremendous a blunder. It cannot seriously propose to establish in the city of New York a subsurface transportation system, destined to become at a day not far distant a part of or to absorb an existing system, without provision for the interchange of rolling stock, the physical union of rails and the like.

It may be that the commission proposes longer station platforms, greater facilities for switching and car storage, but that its members contemplate the creation of a system the motors and cars of which can be used on the present line only by rebuilding the existing tunnels is incredible.

Japan's Railways in 1909.

Japan's first railway was a line eighteen miles long, between Yokohama and Shimbashi, opened for traffic in 1872. Construction and ownership of a national railway system by the Government appears to have been the original purpose, but the plan was abandoned a few years later because of belief that private enterprise would establish more rapidly the much needed routes. In 1885 there were 300 miles of Government line and 293 miles of line privately owned. A law regulating the private lines was passed in 1887. Private construction proceeded more rapidly than official construction and in 1900 there were 816 miles of Government owned lines and 2,725 miles of private line. Soon after the termination of the war with Russia a new policy was adopted. It was officially decided that the conditions of ownership and control then existing resulted in lack of order and uniformity, in excessive cost of operation and in needless delay in the forwarding of merchandise. It was further decided that the Government should purchase all private lines used for general traffic and the railway nationalization bill was passed and approved. The bill was published in the *Official Gazette* of March 31, 1906.

At that time the Government owned 1,541 miles of line and private companies owned 3,251 miles. The bill provided for the purchase of 2,823 miles of the privately owned roads so that the purchase and transfer of those roads, plus new construction, made the Government in 1909 the owner of 4,552 miles of railway and left only 477 miles of unimportant routes under the control of private enterprise. The price paid for the acquired lines was a little less than $250,000,000. The total cost of construction of the lines now owned by the Government is reported as $265,000,000, about $58,000 a mile. The equipment of the lines includes 2,031 engines, 5,286 passenger coaches and 32,568 freight cars.

The acquisition of these lines by the Government appears on the whole to have reduced somewhat the price of passenger and freight transportation. The average passenger rate a mile on the entire system of state and private lines for the five years preceding the transfer is reported as a little more than seven-tenths of a cent, and the average of the state line rates for 1909 is a small fraction below the average of the earlier term. A wider difference appears in the freight rates, the average of the combined state and private line rates for the earlier five year period being .961 cent a ton a mile, the average rate of the state lines in 1909 was .826 cent. Within the last five years there has been a large increase in traffic, both freight and passenger. The total number of passengers carried by all lines in 1904 was 113,870,094, and the total of 1909 was 146,973,870. The total freight tonnage hauled in 1904 was 17,761,312, and in 1909 it reached 25,455,799. The total net earnings of the state lines for 1909 are reported as $18,480,000. The changes caused by the transfer of ownership make difficult if not impossible any fair comparison of earnings in 1909 with the earnings of earlier years. The capitalization of the state lines is reported as $377,000,000, on which the net earnings appear to be about 5 per cent.

The actual working of the system of Government ownership can be better determined a few years hence, but the experience thus far has been fairly satisfactory.

Public Land Openings.

The announcement from Washington that the land and Indian authorities have definitely decided to open no more large tracts of lands to settlement this year comes as a disappointment to many who had looked forward to profiting from the Government lottery. Opportunities for the land hungry in 1910 are thus to be limited to the reservations that were thrown open last month in Minnesota, some 233,000 acres in all, about 6,000 town lots on river town sites in South Dakota and Idaho to be sold at Cœur d'Alene this month, and a tract of 12,000 acres near Lawton, Okla., to be sold in eighty acre lots in November. None of these distributions presents any of the features of the great Oklahoma rush or of the Rosebud lottery; they are only land auctions with Federal authorities in charge.

The chief disappointment this year was the Yakima reservation in the State of Washington. Uncle SAM was at first held responsible for holding out false hopes here, but he has just cleared himself of the charge by showing that much misleading information regarding the reservation was sent out by persons who had intended to deceive the innocent homeseeker as to the amount of land at the disposal of the Government. It was discovered in the course of the investigation that the claims selected by the Indians had exhausted all the good land. "After the allotment shall have been made to the Indians," says the chairman of the Yakima Appraising Commission to the Land Office, "there will not be a quarter section in the reservation open to settlement that a person can make a living on or that would be suitable for any purpose but grazing." The Indians in this case had become such good farmers that they were able to choose the best lands. This incident shows some of the new difficulties arising in the opening up of reservations. The Indian is getting a better idea of the value of his possessions and is driving harder bargains with the Government in the allotments of his permanent homesteads, to which he is entitled, and in the appropriation of tracts for school purposes. Two treaties were "held up" this year, those for lands at Pine Ridge and at Fort Berthold, because the Indians did not believe that the Government was giving them satisfactory terms.

Although this year promises to be fruitless there is reason to believe that 1911 will bring some rich prizes. Congress has passed bills authorizing the opening in North Dakota of the Fort Berthold reservation of 850,000 acres, and in South Dakota of the Pine Ridge reservation of 800,000 acres and the Rosebud reservation of 850,000 acres. The Government already has authority to open in Montana the Blackfeet reservation of 959,000 acres and the Fort Peck reservation of 1,776,000 acres, and in Washington the Colville reservation of 1,300,000 acres. It is expected that after the reductions of allotments for Indians have been made there will remain for distribution in the respective areas these amounts: Blackfeet, 150,000 acres; Fort Peck, 1,000,000 acres; Colville, 1,000,000 acres; Fort Berthold, 300,000 acres; Rosebud, 500,000 acres. The Indian allotments in the Pine Ridge reservation will exhaust the available land. The most valuable of these lands and the portions that will attract the most attention are those included in the Rosebud reservation. Part of this reservation has already been disposed of through lottery and has been made into farms that are now of considerable value. There has been as yet no statement as to the manner of the distribution, but there is every likelihood that the lottery method will be adopted for disposing of the most desirable tracts. Those who have been disappointed this year may look forward to having a chance at a good slice of the public domain next year and console themselves with the thought that the requirements for getting the prizes will be merely luck and patience.

The voters of Tennessee, we take it, are thinking men.—*Nashville American.*

Then what do they think of Pardoner PATTERSON?

The scientists' latest estimate of the earth says not above 20,000,000 or below 55,000,000 years.—*Washington despatch.*

At any rate, old enough to know better.

In the Parks.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—*Sir:* The letters in Sunday's and Monday's issues of THE SUN relating to the dilapidated condition of Madison Square and Battery Park were very timely, but I do not think the criticism of the Park Department should end there. How about City Hall Park, and the finest park the city boasts, Central Park? Both of these could stand a little sprinkling up. The grass in both of them is burned to a crisp and the lawns are dark brown instead of fresh green.

PUBLIC PARKS.

NEW YORK, July 26.

Magazine Covers.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—*Sir:* In view of the fact that the present day muckraking magazine must have an ornate cover, why not embellish each number with the photograph of a subscriber? It would be good business, the advertisement could read something like this:

"Your photograph on the front and a copy of our otherwise beautiful magazine each month for a year. All for 50 cents."

ROBERT CARLTON BROWN.

NEW YORK, July 26.

His Labor Lost.

Atlas was bearing the world on his shoulders.

"How foolish with T. R. on the job," they cried.

Failing, his labor was superfluous.

CONCEALED WEAPONS.

A Magistrate's View of the Constitutionality of State Regulation.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—*Sir:* The great and increasing number of homicides in this country resulting from the use of deadly weapons makes it imperative that the Legislatures of the States should enact statutes that shall be an effective check upon the habit of carrying firearms and also make it incumbent upon all citizens to use their moral and intellectual influence to put a stop to this pernicious and measureless practice. Every State has on its statute books laws the purpose of which is to regulate and suppress the carrying of deadly weapons, but these laws have been found ineffective to check homicides, as they are defective in that they provide no means by which persons who are violating them may be detected and punished. It is with this as with the famous recipe for cooking a rabbit: "First catch your rabbit."

While there are perhaps men who habitually carry weapons for necessary self-defence, the majority of those addicted to the practice do so for the purpose of avenging their private wrongs or through sheer cowardice or, as is frequently the case with the young, because it gives them a martial air and often they are carried by professional criminals who intend to use them whenever committing a crime or to aid them in escaping if detected. In the twenty years that I have been a magistrate in this county I have tried a large number of cases of homicide, and in every instance I have observed that the slayers, conspicuous that he was himself armed or the weapon that his opponent was armed or could easily arm himself has suggested the thought of the homicide. Could we have the statistics of murder collated this would probably be found to be the case in every instance. However, it is not my purpose to discuss the metaphysics of murder, but rather to offer some suggestions as to the character of legislation that would check the carrying and use of deadly weapons.

Let each State enact a statute forbidding any one keeping or carrying any deadly weapon out of a certain length of barrel and size of bore. Say, for instance, no one shall be allowed to keep or carry any weapon save a double barrel shotgun. Then take a hint from the prohibition statutes of Mississippi and authorize the Sheriff or other officer whenever he has reason to believe that any one is violating the provisions of this statute to apply to the nearest magistrate or court for a search warrant to search the premises and person of the suspect. If a prohibited weapon is found the offender upon conviction should be subjected to heavy penalties and the weapon destroyed.

Would such a law be constitutional? Would it not be in conflict with the Second Amendment of the Constitution of the United States and of the Bill of Rights of the several State Constitutions? These are very pertinent questions and should be answered fully. I do not think that such legislation would be unconstitutional. The Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States says: "A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed," and the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of Mississippi, section 12, is as follows: "The right of every citizen to keep and bear arms in defence of his home, person or property, or in aid of the civil power when thereto legally summoned, shall not be called in question, but the Legislature may regulate or forbid carrying concealed weapons." These two provisions have been copied almost verbatim into the Constitution and Bill of Rights of every State in the Union, and the judicial interpretation given to one applies to all.

In an early period of our history the question of the constitutional right to carry deadly weapons came up before the Supreme Court of the United States for adjudication in the case of United States vs. Cruikshanks, 92 U. S., 542-553 L. Ed., 588, the court saying:

"The right of bearing arms for a lawful purpose is not a right granted by the Constitution, neither is it in any manner dependent upon that instrument for its existence. The Second Amendment declares that it shall not be infringed, but this means no more than that it shall not be infringed by Congress."

Again, in the subsequent case of Presser vs. Illinois, 116 U. S., 252, 29 L. Ed., 615, the court said:

"Prohibiting bodies of men other than the organized militia of the State and troops of the United States from assembling as a military company and drilling with arms in cities and towns is not such a prohibition against keeping or bearing arms as unlawfully deprives the United States of its rightful resource for maintaining the public security or peace or disables the public from performing their duties toward the national Government."

These decisions show quite plainly that the States can by legislative or constitutional enactments restrict or prohibit the keeping or carrying of deadly weapons, and such restriction or prohibition will not be a violation of the Second Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

The different States of the Union have adopted statutes regulating the carrying of deadly weapons, and in only one State, Kentucky, has this law been declared unconstitutional (see Bliss vs. Commonwealth, 2d Littel, 90, 13 Am. Dec., 251; the State of Kentucky, however, afterward amended its Constitution, and in a case before the Supreme Court of that State the conviction of a man (see 7 Bush, 392) who was carrying to the purchaser a pistol that had been purchased by him was sustained). The Supreme Court of Louisiana (State vs. Smith, 11 A., 633, and State vs. Duvol, 13 A., 306) has held not only that the statute was constitutional but that a citizen could not carry a deadly weapon partially concealed. In Wilson vs. The State (63 Miss., 404, 33 Southern Rep., 171) the Supreme Court of Mississippi not only held that the law was constitutional but that under this law A man could not carry a deadly weapon concealed within his own home and on State vs. Bolling, 76 Miss., 57, 19 Southern Rep., 99) it was held that an unloaded pistol was within the prohibition of the statute. The Supreme Court of Tennessee has sustained the constitutionality of a law (see Andrews vs. State, 8 Am. Rep., 8) that forbade the carriage concealed about the person of an Arkansas toothpick, "bowie knife." As the State of Texas has long been the butt of the humorist for the alleged propensity of her citizens to carry deadly weapons of every kind, it is refreshing to quote from the master opinion of Walker J. (English vs. State, 35 Tex., 473, 14 Am. Rep., 374) the court in sustaining the constitutionality of the statute saying that "the right to keep and bear arms meant only the right to keep and bear arms as a member of the militia or as a soldier." Continuing, Judge Walker says:

"It will doubtless work a great improvement in the moral and social condition of men when every man shall come fully to understand that the strong arm of a great social compact under and by which States and communities are bound together each individual has compromised the right to avenge his own wrongs and must look to the State for redress. It is useless to talk about personal privileges being infringed by laws such as that under consideration. The world has seen too much licentiousness cloaked under the name of natural or personal liberty, natural and personal liberty are exchanged under the social compact of States for civil liberty. It is not our purpose to make an argument in justification of the law. The history of our own country but too well justifies the enactment of such laws. A law is not to be set aside because it may be repugnant to the wishes or distasteful to a class of the community, for it is generally to that class that the law is more especially addressed. Were such a rule to obtain in civilized States it would operate a retrocession of all legislative functions, the mob would assume to declare what should be law and what should not. There would be no reform, no end of evils in society. Communities and states would degenerate fast in proportion as their laws were wise and wholesome, or foolish and immoral. The law under consideration has been attacked upon the ground that it was contrary to public policy and deprived the people of the necessary means of self-defence, that it was an innovation upon the customs and habits of the people to which they would not submit. We do not think the people of Texas are so bad as this and we do not think that the latter half of the nineteenth century is too soon for Christian and civilized States to legislate against any and every species of crime. Ever system of public laws should be in itself the purest and best system of public morality. The object and purpose of all law should be the promotion and advancement of the happiness and well being of the people upon whom the law operates."

In the case of State vs. Workman, 14 L. Rep., An., 699, the Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia, through Lucas, president, paid its respects to the "pistol toter" and incidentally to the Supreme Court of Kentucky (see Carroll vs. Commonwealth, 7 Bush, 124), in language that is most caustic and deserving of a most attentive perusal, but it is too long for quotation here and I must rest satisfied with only a short abstract from the opinion.

"The presumption which the law establishes that every man who goes armed in the midst of a peaceable community is of vile character is in consonance with the common law and one which ought to prevail in every community which aspires to be well civilized. Neither would there be any constitutional violation in enacting that any person who proves good character should be acquitted by the jury upon lighter evidence to his good faith in his plea of self defence than should a person who tacitly admits himself to be of evil fame by failing to introduce evidence to the contrary. This is discriminating, it is true, between classes, but it is only a discrimination in favor of the citizens class against the dangerous and vicious."

See also State vs. Reid, 1 Ala., 612, 35 Am. Dec.; State vs. Buntard, 4 Ark., 18; Carroll vs. State, 28 Ark., 99, 10 Am. Rep., 326; Bailey vs. State, 39 Ark., 274, 43 Am. Rep., 266; Aymette vs. State, 2 Hump., 154; Nunn vs. State, 1 Ga., 243; State vs. Wilforth, 74 Mo., 528, 41 Am. Rep., 320; State vs. Speller, 89 N. C., 565; Wright vs. Comm., 78 Pa., 470, besides the cases already cited.

I have made numerous quotations from the various Supreme Courts for the purpose of answering the puerile objections so often made to suggestions for needful legislation. "It is useless to enact such a law, as the court will not enforce it." The citations and quotations made above show that the court will sustain and enforce the law, provided that the Legislature gives it a law that can be enforced.

Such laws if enacted will not of themselves alone be sufficient to cure the national malady. No law, as Lincoln pointed out many centuries ago, can be effective that is not sustained by a healthy public sentiment, and to secure such a sentiment we must make use of the most powerful of all intellectual or moral forces, education. The youth of this land must be taught from a cradle upward that not a gentleman but a vile coward goes armed in a peaceable community, and that no man has the right to avenge his own private wrongs or to take the life of another save in necessary self-defence. In this work of education all parties and creeds can meet upon a common ground, for the suggestion of brotherhood is neither a political nor a religious but an ethical question, and however much men may differ as to the tariff there all must admit that the coward, the bully has no place in civilized society.

The measure that I propose for the suppression of the carrying and use of deadly weapons may not be the best. Other and better minds may offer something better. If so, let them come forward and give the public the benefit of their thought, and then let the Legislature choose that which is best.

CHARLES S. CHASE.

FAIRMOUNT, Minn., July 24.

THE ROYAL ARCANUM.

Has There Been Unfair Treatment of the Older Members?

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—*Sir:* I must take exception to the remarks of your correspondent F. A. Huber. The Royal Arcanum is supposed to be a secret beneficiary organization. The increase of the assessments when it went into effect was a sound business move, dictated by not only common sense but necessity if the purposes of the order were to be carried out.

But it carried with it an unfair discrimination against those older members who had supported the organization. For the greatest number of years by imposing an assessment on those who had reached the age of 45 almost prohibitive to those whose earning power had decreased with the weight of their years.

This was not democratic, but a sharp advantage to deserving those who most needed the benefits of the order by driving them out.

It would have been fairer and more humane to put an extra tax on the active members of the order to help these old fellows rather than let this stain blur the name of an organization which stands for virtue, honor, charity.

E.

New York, July 26.

A Cynic on the Jubilee.

From the Charleston News and Courier.

The editors of the chuffout are determined that the wisdom of their distinguished contributing editor shall not be wasted. For that reason, we may suppose, or at the suggestion of the Colonel himself, they have been sending his editorial articles about the country with instructions that they can be printed at such and such a time. For instance, the remarkable paper on proofreading, which contained so much that was new and startling, was in the hands of newspaper editors before the chuffout for that week was on sale at the newsstands.

We were about to suggest that the ex-President might syndicate his articles and have them printed simultaneously all over the country. Wisdom such as his should not be confined to any one set of readers, nor to any one people. They might appear simultaneously in all the countries of the world, although somebody has intimated that in Java and some other countries our Solon has never been heard of. We pity the ignorance of these unfortunate peoples. Why not appoint a general board to spread to the far corners of the earth the Roosevelt-an wisdom? Mr. Carnegie would doubtless be very glad to properly endow it.

As matter of fact, if Mr. Roosevelt continues to write he will find himself in the position of an ordinary mortal before very long. He does not express himself any better than scores of other writers, if as well, and his original thoughts were known to philosophers and others many centuries ago. His facile pen opens no unexplored countries, nor does it illuminate the dark caverns. His work unsigned would not be quoted in a single metropolitan paper, and probably by but few country weeklies. He must be a greater politician than he is an editor, otherwise he will soon rest in the political graveyard with other paragons who have gone before.

Place Names.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—*Sir:* At the risk of being somewhat personal I should like to inquire what Arthur L. Evans and Henry E. Knight had taken to cause them to see double in transcribing the Indian name of the pond just later in Webster, Mass.? As they are both Gothamites, they probably both imbibed the same kind of beverage and with the same result. While John Hayward in his gazetteer has twenty-six letters in the name of this pond, these chaps have forty-eight letters, or twenty-two more. The name of the pond as Hayward gives it is Chargoggagoggmanchaugagoggchaubunagungamaugg. Certainly the name is long enough without adding twenty-two more letters.

According to Lippincott's gazetteer there are twenty-two towns, villages or post villages by the name of Mount Vernon in the United States. In it is a description of the pretty little town in Hillsborough county, N. H., which, it is said, should be known by the name of Mont Vernon. While there are a few towns or villages by the name Montvale and Montville there is none in the gazetteer by the name of Mont Vernon.

I will let U. S. N. fight out the matter of the name of this pretty little town with the editors of the gazetteer.

HOWARD CONG.

CONCORD, N. H., July 25.

The Sound of Thunder.

From the London Daily Graphic.

It is to Professor Trowbridge that we owe an experiment to explain the noise of thunder. It has usually been thought that the noise is caused by the closing up of the vacuum created by the passage of the lightning, the air rushing in from all sides with a clap, but the intensity of the noise is rather disproportionate, and it is now supposed that the thunder is due to the intense heating of the gases, especially the gas of water vapor along the line of the electric discharge, and the consequent conversion of suspended moisture into steam at enormous pressure. In this way the crackle with which a peal of thunder sometimes begins might be regarded as the sound of steam explosions on a small scale caused by inductive discharges before the main flash. The rumble would be the overlapping steam explosions, and the final clap, which sounds loudest would be the steam explosion nearest to the conductor. In the case of rumbling thunder the lightning is passing from cloud to cloud. When the flash passes from the earth to the clouds the clap is loudest at the beginning. Professor Trowbridge gave substance to these suppositions by causing electric flashes to pass from point to point through terminals contained in soaked cotton wool, and he succeeded in magnifying the crack of the electric spark to a terrifying extent.

The Poker Face.

From the Denver Republican.

"I am surprised at nothing," recently said John W. Keene. Indeed:

In this journey men call life,
Do not let your thoughts betray you.
You will find mid all the strife
That a poker face will pay you.
If upon your head some day
A sky pilot is protected
You should yawn a bit and say
"Twas expected."

Always be upon your guard
Let no circumstance astound you.
With serenity unmarred
Gaze upon those who surround you.
When your wife says: "Listen, dear;
Meat is cheaper, do you know it?"
Though you feel a 31 quite near
Do not throw it.

When your taxes fall quite low
When your bills are all collected
When your auto troubles go
Far beneath what you expected,
When you fit to a resort
And you find it all "twas painted,
Just deny the base report
That you've fainted.

THE NEW MARRIAGE LAW.

Criticism of Some of the Problems of the Statute.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—*Sir:* As an automobilist of nine years experience, and having driven one of all kinds upward of 30,000 miles, I rise to say that the new automobile law is certainly very defective in some respects.

After providing rigid examinations and most carefully devised schemes to prevent incompetent, drunken and foul chauffeurs from operating motor vehicles, the gentleman who drafted the law and the balance of the incompetent motorists occupying seats in the Legislature left the way open for any incompetent who has the money to buy an automobile to start out on a path of trouble and devastation.

An instrument that only partially protects does not protect to any remarkable extent. It is well known to people who are acquainted with automobiles that the majority of accidents are directly traceable to the new crop of operating owners who are turned loose on our highways as soon as they pass a test.

Men who have money to buy automobiles always think that they know enough to run them. The very fact that they have the necessary amount of cash seems to inspire them with confidence in their ability. I remember very well that when I first began to run an automobile I had a very unworkable control of it. I did not realize this at the time. I thought I was a thorough master of the situation, but as I have look back upon my many narrow escapes I realize that the most dangerous operator of an automobile is the beginner or owner who has recently acquired a machine. It takes many months to learn to run a motor with safety, and it then necessarily must be run by automatisms. A perfect automobile operating mechanism works least, changes his gears and pulls on his brakes without conscious thought. Every necessary movement for the control of the machine is made automatically, and until a man does this he is not a safe operator. If a driver had to think where the levers were before he could strike them he would indeed be a sorry performer. It is only because the finished performer is able to strike the levers by automatisms, or automatically, that he becomes a perfect driver.

When you consider that more than half of the automobiles are operated by owners, you realize what a grave danger is left unprotected by this new law. As it stands to-day anybody with the price, man or woman, may go out and purchase an automobile and straightway beat it out and run across a few friends.

The law should have been specifically directed against preventing any incompetent chauffeur, owner or person from running a machine. As a general proposition a man wanting a position as a chauffeur does not apply until he has a certain amount of knowledge and experience. The majority of cases that are driven by chauffeurs are largely owned by men who have long since learned to drive their own car, and the taxicabs and other public vehicles are owned by companies which have competent men to pass upon the abilities of all applicants. Thus it will be seen that there is no protection against foul owners in the new law, and it is therefore very incomplete and needs immediate revision. Beyond providing the State with a handsome revenue it is no better than the old law. It will keep the police busy, but our thoroughfares will be no safer.

I think you will find that all experienced owners will agree with me on this point. What are our lawgivers going to do about it?

CHARLES H. DAVIS.

NEW YORK, July 26.

INDIA.

A Native Clergyman's Views of the State of Popular Feeling.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—*Sir:* A friend in London has recently interviewed the Rev. V. S. Azariah, a Hindu, who came to England to take part in the great missionary conference which has recently been held and whose eloquent speeches in the most polished English have excited considerable attention. Mr. Azariah is a native of Tinnevelly, in south India, and is the Christian pastor of a distinctly independent church.

Mr. Azariah says that the reported unrest in India has been very greatly exaggerated by both the English and vernacular newspapers. This political feeling must of necessity be restricted to an infinitesimal section of the population of 300,000,000 in British India, because 94 per cent. of the whole is completely illiterate, and very few of the 6 per cent. know anything of the English language.

It may be truly said that most of the people don't care a jot for the political propaganda started by a few English speaking natives in large cities. The great bulk of the people know nothing of representative government, for they never heard of such a thing, and they are fairly satisfied with the British administration.

The natives of India are divided into at least 2,000 castes. The natives who are brought in daily contact with English people have undoubtedly anti-racial feelings, but it is nothing like the race prejudice in the United States of America. In India lynching is unknown.

ANGLO-INDIAN.

BROOKLYN, July 26.

"The Lord's Box."

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—*Sir:* I went to church to-day, taking the trolley to a town of about five thousand. The minister told the following story:

A young German was converted in February, and in March decided that he ought to give a tenth to the Lord. He set up a "Lord's Box" in his shop—he was a shoemaker—and into this box put a tenth of all the money that he took in. After some time he found himself in financial difficulties owing to the fact that he could not collect a number of large bills and that he had no credit at the wholesalers. Being out of money he went to the "Lord's Box" and opened it. He found a considerable sum in it and was considering borrowing it to use in the business, but finally decided not to do so. He took the money and gave two thirds to the pastor to establish a mission in China, and one third to the treasurer of the church.

Then, the box being empty, he reasoned within himself thus: "Now the box is empty, the Lord must have money to carry on His work, therefore He will send money. This will bring money into the shop and I shall have money to do business with."

That same day a man came in who owed a large bill, saying that he had just recollected that he owed the shoemaker and had come to pay him, and in less than three days the German had money enough to do business with and the "Lord's Box" was soon almost running over.

A. ROMAN.

KEYSER PARK, July 24.

A Mystery of the Jersey Coast.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—*Sir:* I spent a part of my vacation last year at Beach Haven, N. J., about the most inaccessible spot on the coast and literally six miles at sea. While there I learned that from time to time in the last twenty years quantities of Spanish silver coins have been washed up on the shore after severe storms and that these coins were found in about the same spot.

I saw quantities of these coins, one man having a woman's sterling purse filled, and another a cigar box quite full. No two of the natives could agree as to the probable source of this treasure trove, so I referred the matter to the New Jersey Historical Society, which replied courteously that my inquiry had been submitted to a Mr. Macaulay, who knew more of the New Jersey coast than any one else and that he was of the opinion the coins came from the wreck of the American ship Howard, lost off Beach Haven in the '30s.

Efforts to learn the story of the Howard have not been successful, and the natives agreed that the coins were all more than a hundred years old. A handsome specimen presented to me by the finder is dated 1725.

Of course, if the history of this boat should show that she was likely to carry nothing but Spanish money Mr. Macaulay's opinion would be all but conclusive. As it is, the known facts make up a pretty romance which should bear investigation.

C. A. B.

NEW YORK, July 26.

Fixing the Blame.

From the Washington Star.

He ate clear through the bill of fare,
And did so several times a day.
The salad green he did not spare,
And sweets he hastily put away.
And when the hour of reckoning came,
In accents sorrowing, but sure,
He said: "The climate is to blame
For all the suffering I endure."

He quickly made a frosty glass
In haste, for fear the draught might thaw.
Sometimes in dotages I would pass
His lips, and sometimes through a straw.
And when the ambulance drew nigh
The friends who gathered round about
Bent over him and heard him sigh:
"This weather's put me down and out!"

THE CHEAPER DRESS.

Economies Not Foreign Markets the Main Aim of American Mills.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—*Sir:* Is the statement of a Southern cotton mill president, reported in your issue of July 24, worthing about? He is quoted as saying that the American manufacturers are not looking for foreign markets for their goods, but that the home market is the one they are after. Is this true? Are not the manufacturers, from a correspondent's standpoint, building for a foreign market? The business of a Southern cotton mill, producing the highest wages and the most wholesome village life, without a dollar investment of a progressive town. Every thread of the woof is made, and the warp is made, and the manufacturer, and the operatives, and the merchants, and the consumers, are all from China and South America. Is it not a fact that the cotton mills are employed and put upon the race to get in a full generation, will you, and we, the nation, making this mill, despite opposition? Not a thread is sold in the United States.

This particular mill does not even spend a cent of protection. The cotton labor hardly enters into the question, wages, dividends, &c. Only the China trade, but not the mills, is hundred million trade goods are more than those that we are seeking manufacturers. Nobody has any care of the South are trading goods for the Pacific together. They have to deal with South American trade to speak of, and care for it. The cotton company is doing business in the South, and the village with schools and other accessories