The Sun.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1911.

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. F. Laffan, 170 Nassau street; Secretary of the Association, D. W. Quinn, 170 Nassau street.

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, Charing Cross Road.

Paris office, 6 Rue de la Michodière, off Rue du Quatre Septembre (near Place 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 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.

Singular Misunderstanding on the Part of Mr. Olney.

In the face of the Hay memorandum the Hon. RICHARD OLNEY, formerly Secretary of State, persists in his conviction that this nation is bound by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty not to fortify the Panama Canal; that this nation, although sole owner of the canal, is under contract with Great Britain not to exercise full power as to the method of its protection and defence. Mr. OLNEY says in a statement published yesterday:

"If in this regard there had been any intent to go back on the principle and policy of previous treaties—of the treaty of 1850 and of the draft treaty of February 5, 1900—surely the right to fortify the canal would have been conceded in express terms instead of not being mentioned at all. Nor can it be fairly argued that the United States has a right in its discretion to determine fortification to be a part of the military policing of the canal and to fortify accordingly."

But there was, in fact, an intent on the part of Great Britain to go back on the principle and policy of previous treaties. In negotiating the second Hay-Pauncefote treaty, after the failure of the first draft, Great Britain intended and frankly avowed her intention to put canal defence on a basis not previously contemplated by her statesmen. Great Britain desired to withdraw from participation in military responsibility and to put the entire military responsibility upon the United States. The British Government changed its previous attitude completely in this respect. It stated its reason for desiring the radical change from joint to single responsibility under the new treaty. Its intent and desire were apparent not only in Mr. HAY's memorandum for the private information of the Senate, a document which Mr. OLNEY strangely enough treats as if he thought his successor scarcely knew what he was talking about, but also in the official communication of the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the British Ambassador at Washington, dated August 3, 1901. Lord LANSDOWNE wrote:

"In form the new draft differs from the convention of 1900, under which the high contracting parties, after agreeing that the canal might be constructed by the United States, undertook to adopt certain rules as the basis upon which the canal was to be neutralized. In the new draft the United States intimate *their* readiness 'to adopt' somewhat similar rules as the basis of the neutralization of the canal. It would appear that *the whole responsibility for upholding these rules, and thereby maintaining the neutrality of the canal, would henceforward be assumed by the United States. The change in form is an important one,* but in view of the fact that the whole cost of the construction of the canal is to be borne by that Government, which is also charged with such measures as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder, his Majesty's Government are not likely to object to it. * * * In my despatch [of February 22, 1900, to Lord PAUNCEFOTE] I pointed out the dangerous ambiguity of an instrument in which one clause permitted the adoption of defensive measures while another prohibited the erection of fortifications. *It is most important that no doubt should exist as to the intention of the contracting parties. As to this, I understand that by the omission of all reference to the matter of defence the United States desire to reserve the power of taking measures to protect the canal, at any time when the United States may be at war, from destruction or damage at the hands of an enemy or enemies.* On the other hand I conclude that *with the above exception* there is no intention to derogate from the principles of neutrality laid down by the rules. As to the first of these propositions, I am not prepared to deny that contingencies may arise when not only from a national point of view but on behalf of the commercial interests of the whole world it might be of *supreme importance to the United States that they should be free to adopt measures for the defence of the canal at a moment when they were themselves engaged in hostilities.*"

That is why Great Britain, herself desiring to be relieved of joint responsibility with the United States for the defence of the canal against hostile operations, herself proposed the omission of the rule inhibiting fortification. The significance of the omission was comprehended as clearly by Lord LANSDOWNE as by Mr. HAY. And yet Mr. OLNEY, ten years afterward, advances this extraordinary theory of a misunderstanding between the American and British negotiators:

"The objections to construing a written agreement by the recollections of one or both of the parties to it are too obvious to need mention and *find apt illustration in the case under consideration.* If the negotiator on one side may have thought the express prohibition against fortification was dropped because unfair to the United States, the negotiator on the other side may have thought it was dropped because needless and in effect superseded by the express permission to protect the canal by military police."

The rule permitting military police as a protection against ordinary lawlessness and disorder in time of peace was not substituted, as Mr. OLNEY seems to imply, for the rule prohibiting fortification. The military police clause was in the first draft as it is in the treaty which was ratified. It was merely transferred to another place in the code of rules for convenience of makeup. Its presence in the ratified treaty has no relation to the significance of the omission in the ratified treaty of the anti-fortification rule. The meaning of that omission was plain to both Secretary HAY and to Lord LANSDOWNE. They were recording respectively their understanding at the actual time of the negotiations, not ten years afterward, like Mr. OLNEY. They were construing the text of the treaty creatively in 1901, and not ex parte and controversially, like Mr. OLNEY in 1911.

It would seem that the only misunderstanding of Lord LANSDOWNE'S intent that is possible to the unprejudiced mind depends upon a verbal arrangement in the last sentence from his memorandum as quoted above. We wonder that some ingenious opponents of fortification have not already perceived the chance and made the most of it. The British Government recorded its desire that the United States "should be free to adopt measures for the defence of the canal at a moment when they were themselves engaged in hostilities." By construing the words "at a moment" as applying to "the adoption of measures" rather than to "the defence of the canal," what a powerful argument might be advanced for the proposition that although Great Britain left us free to build forts to defend the canal she meant to provide that the erection of these forts must not begin until the very moment when we should find ourselves at war and in dire need of them!

Mr. OLNEY'S controversial teeth are gnawing at something considerably harder than corundum when he attempts to dispose of the deliberate excision of the Suez rule prohibiting fortification as if that excision really signified nothing and left the Suez code exactly as it was before. Other gentlemen who now are arguing along the same precarious lines are in the same predicament. What the omission meant in the minds of both negotiators is on record in Mr. HAY'S private memorandum and in Lord LANSDOWNE'S official statement, through Lord PAUNCEFOTE, of the British understanding. On each side the understanding was clear, explicit and unqualified, and on both sides the understanding was the same.

Further Proof.

At the last State election the total plurality of the twenty-nine Democratic Senators then elected was 89,651. The average plurality for the individual candidate was then 3,100. The total plurality of the twenty-four Senators who are supporting the Hon. WILLIAM F. SHEEHAN was 87,275. The average plurality for this group was thus 3,600.

The total plurality of the five Democratic Senators who are opposing the Hon. WILLIAM F. SHEEHAN as well as the plurality of each is shown in the following table:

LOREN H. WHITE	196
GEORGE B. BURD	250
F. M. LOOMIS	280
JOHN G. SAXE	500
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT	1,140
Total	2,376

The average plurality of each of these five was therefore 475. By placing this figure of 475 against the 3,600 of the other group it will again be apparent how accurate and irrefutable is the statement that the five "insurgent" Senators represent the overwhelming majority of the Democrats of this State.

Great Cities.

Last month's census in Germany shows that the cities are growing rapidly. There are in the country now forty-eight cities of over 100,000 population, seven more than appeared in the census of 1905.

A very remarkable fact about Berlin is now definitely ascertained. While the population of the city proper has increased only 24,005 in the past five years, its outlying districts have grown so that the population of Greater Berlin in December, 1910, was 3,712,554, against 2,989,126 in December, 1905. Thus the suburban districts have about 700,000 more population to-day than in 1905. This increase is attributed by the census office to the fact that the rapid rebuilding in Berlin is turning residence districts into business blocks, appropriating large tracts for public purposes and forcing many thousands of people to find new homes on the outskirts of the city.

Some other countries, however, are surpassing Germany in the multiplication of large cities. Our thirty-eight cities of 100,000 population or over in the census of 1900 have grown to fifty in the census of 1910. The thirty-nine large cities in the United Kingdom in 1900 grew to forty-four by the middle of 1909, and may reach fifty in the enumeration of April this year.

The figures show further that the United States is far ahead of Germany in the total population of the large cities. Our fifty largest cities number 21,300,000, or 23 per cent. of the total population of the country, while the forty-eight largest cities of Germany have a population of 13,690,000.

The Cost of Our Battleships.

Secretary MEYER has shown in his testimony before the Naval Committee of the House that it will cost at least $1,500,000 more to build the new battleship New York in a Government yard than to build the Texas, a sister ship, in one of the private yards. Of course the eight hour law has a good deal to do with increased cost, but that applies to private yards as well as to navy yards in the case of Government work. Where Secretary MEYER figures the difference in cost is in "disability," "leave" and "holidays," with the pay going on:

"All navy yard employees receive pay for seven national holidays; laborers and mechanics are allowed fifteen days leave with pay after one year's service, but no sick leave; per diem classified employees (clerks, draftsmen, inspectors, messengers, watchmen, &c.) are allowed fifteen days leave, and in exceptional and meritorious cases can be granted fifteen additional days on account of sickness; per annum classified employees at navy yards are allowed thirty days leave, and in exceptional and meritorious cases can be granted thirty days additional on account of sickness; by Executive order four hours (exclusive of time for luncheon) constitute a day's work on Saturdays during the months of July, August and September of each year for all clerks and other employees of the Federal Government wherever employed, with the proviso that the order shall not apply to any bureau or office of the Government, or to any of the clerks or other employees thereof that may for special public reasons be excepted therefrom by the head of the department having supervision or control of such bureau or office, or where the same would be inconsistent with the provisions of the existing law."

Some idea of the extra expense involved may be derived from money losses to the Government so caused in the New York Navy Yard alone for the year 1910:

Disability	$118.80
Leave	$162,837.60
Holiday	$159,912.67
Total	$323,279.17

In addition to this large amount, which in a private yard would not appear, there is another source of increased cost in navy yards which the Secretary explained by stating that the Government establishments employ the higher class labor on all parts of the building ship, whereas the contractors use cheaper labor, apprentices, &c., in very many details, and find that they answer quite as well. He showed, moreover, that as everything is done under Government inspection, and as this inspection is perhaps a little more vigilant in private yards than in regular navy yards, there is no visible difference of efficiency in the finished results. To this conclusion all the navy experts in their various spheres have testified.

Congress, therefore, is now in possession of all the facts. The country will have an opportunity to appraise the yearning for economy on the part of our lawgivers by examining the perfected navy bill as it emerges from that august contemplation.

The End of a Once Ambitious Waterway.

In its memorial praying the Legislature to permit "the abandonment of navigation" on the Morris Canal and "the sale of the remaining fragments of property," the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, lessee of the Morris Canal and Banking Company, says pathetically:

"There is no personal property except a small number of boats, with mules, tools, harness, &c. The whole has an indefinite but small value."

The value of the boats and mules is much less indefinite, however, than the value of the canal and the water rights acquired by the lessee for the purpose of competing with rival railroads in carrying freight. The history of the Morris Canal as given by the petitioner strikes us as the most interesting contribution that has been made to the "literature" of transportation for a long time. The Werts commission reported in 1905: "Ownership of the canal as a canal would be of no value to the State." It is certainly a white elephant on the hands of the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, which pays taxes on an assessment of $3,379,823, and during the last twenty years has had to post in its books losses of $4,934,409.79 on the property. As a successful enterprise the canal was doomed before its birth.

"While the charter was being passed GEORGE STEPHENSON was perfecting the invention of a locomotive, and the Stockton and Darlington Railroad in England was opened, with steam transportation, nine months after the canal was chartered. Railroad development thereupon became so rapid that in 1830, a year before the canal was opened for use, the State of New Jersey had chartered the Camden and Amboy Railroad Company, and thereafter proceeded quickly to charter several others. The Morris and Essex Railroad, paralleling the canal from end to end, was chartered in 1835, one year before the canal was opened to Jersey City."

It was provided in the charter that the State might take the canal at an appraised value in 1924; but if the State should not so elect, then the charter should continue for a further term of fifty years, at the expiration of which time "the said canal with its appurtenances should become the sole property of the State." This solemn arrangement seems amusing enough now in the light of the petition of the railroad company, which leased the canal in 1871 with the idea that a business of transporting coal in competition with the Central of New Jersey and other railroads could be developed. The Lehigh Valley, which then ended at the Delaware River, soon surrendered and built a railroad to Perth Amboy and Jersey City. It was bad enough to make a poor bargain and lose millions, but to be accused of ruining the canal by taking freight from it was adding insult to injury. The Lehigh Valley deposes in its defence that for nearly thirty years after obtaining the lease it "deliberately diverted to the canal from 250,000 to 300,000 tons of coal a year to give it something to do."

All these years, however, water has continued to flow in the channel cut through New Jersey from the Delaware to the Hudson and lifted, as it were, over mountains. To fill the ditch—it is no disrespect to use the term—millions of gallons have been drawn from the Musconetong, Pompton and Rockaway rivers and from the dammed lakes of Hopatcong and Greenwood; pure potable water coveted at various times by cities concerned about their supply. Originally the canal property was not taxed, the charter expressly providing that it should be exempt, but in 1886 the State repudiated this part of the contract and assessed the canal and appurtenances under the railroad and canal tax act. Paying something, and a considerable sum too, for nothing is a little hard even on a railroad company. "This useless, outgrown ditch," the unfortunate lessee calls the canal ruined by quick railroad transportation. "It cannot be made to pay," exclaims the Lehigh Valley, "unless railroads are abandoned."

President THOMAS N. MCCARTER of the Public Service Corporation of New Jersey recently proposed that the bed of the canal in Newark be used for a street railway subway. That probably will be the use to put it to when "navigation" is abandoned by sanction of the Legislature. The lessee, drained of millions needed in its business, is ready to convey to New Jersey all its land and water rights at Lake Hopatcong and Greenwood Lake and its rights to divert water from various streams and rivers in order to wind up the affairs of the Morris Canal and Banking Company and be relieved itself of onerous taxation. We suspect that the cottagers at Hopatcong and Greenwood who know what those fine lakes owe to the canal company's dams are a little anxious about the action of the State, but the general desire for conservation should reassure them. The State will not deprive them of the water before their doors. As to the water that flows in the canal, it can be husbanded for the growing needs of cities through which it now flows.

The Contrast.

From the editorial columns of the *Evening Post* of October 1, 1910, we take the following:

"On the whole the outcome at Rochester puts the Democrats in excellent fighting trim. We have a good candidate and a sound and forward leading platform. Mr. Dix is his own man. No boss forced his nomination and no boss will stand in his shadow. For the first time in many years the New York Democracy is in a position to assert itself as in the days when TILDEN and CLEVELAND were able to rally the independent vote, inspire their own party and give it efficiency in the State and leadership in the nation."

In the news columns of the same excellent journal of February 15, 1911, appears this statement:

"Never again, declare the Independents, will the conditions that existed at Rochester be tolerated."

What words could add to the eloquence of this contrast?

The Hon. SMALLBILL WHITE, Emporia's and Chautauqua's darling, having blown one of his wonted thrilling blasts about "pork" and one wicked thing and another in the Kansas Senate, was summoned before that body and a vain attempt was made to have him disclose what if anything of fact lay behind his wild and frothing yawp. The Topeka *Capital* shows us SMALLBILL unabashed:

"He was asked as to what knowledge he based the pork barrel charges on.

"'On my own knowledge and the means the Lord has given me for finding out things,' answered the witness. 'I don't blame, morally, any man who is in the deal for doing what he can for his constituents, but he ought to take a broader view and act in the matter for the good of the whole State.'

"'Were you not mistaken in this article in what you said about the Senators?' asked Senator BREWSTER.

"'In so far as I said that the Senators did not dare go on the witness stand I was mistaken and I apologize,' cheerfully agreed the witness.

"'Is it not a fact that you are the only person who is concealing the information that would permit us to go ahead with this investigation?' was asked.

"'The cigars are on your humble servant,' said the witness.

"'Then you admit that you are concealing the only information that would enable us to put the Senators on the stand, the Senators who gave you this information about a pork barrel?'

"'Absolutely,' was the cheerful reply."

That the Hon. SMALLBILL WHITE ever has had any information to conceal or to impart is a comic conception worthy of the Hon. EDGAR WATSON HOWE and probably original with him. Mr. WHITE'S appearance before the Kansas Senate was worthy of his fame as a publicist. He knew nothing and he revealed the full extent of his knowledge. The only shadow upon his triumph is the vicious remark of some rival or reactionary on the *Capital* who speaks of him as "the fat Emporia editor." Is this a dignified way of referring to a glory of Kansas, a man lean in proportion to the thought that gnaws him?

The weather is freezing to night, but the Federals still keep guard on roofs in Juarez.—*From an El Paso despatch.*

Very soldierly conduct on the part of the Federals, but it is better for them to mount guard than to have their blood frozen by a sudden descent of the slaughter breathing insurrectos.

Nashville is technically in Tennessee, but is it in the world? Some "old world" flavor, a freshness of the first dawn comes when you find the Hon. LUKE LEA'S *Tennessean* explaining to that uninvaded Eden that Colonel BRYAN'S "Prince of Peace" lecture, now being delivered for the hundred and odd thousandth time, "is not a political lecture, as a number of people have supposed." Editorially, the Hon. LUKE LEA'S organ asks "why this man should touch the human heart of every nation." He certainly "touches" the pockets of this nation.

ADMIRAL AND ORPHANS.

A True Story Told at the Expense of the Late Charles S. Sperry.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* There is a story current in the navy about the late Admiral Sperry which has always been regarded as "one on the old man." Shortly after he hoisted his flag as Commander in Chief on board the Connecticut at San Francisco, Admiral Evans having relinquished the command, Mrs. Sperry secured the Admiral's permission to bring on board a party of orphans from an asylum in San Francisco to inspect the flagship.

Under the guidance of petty officers selected by the officer of the deck the children were shown about the ship, and after a visit of an hour or more they were landed in the ship's boats, much to the delight and the satisfaction of the Admiral and Mrs. Sperry.

Soon after the boats had left the ship with the enthusiastic children, the Admiral, who was pacing the sacred precincts of the starboard side of the quarterdeck in solitary state, called the officer of the deck over to him and said in his quiet Connecticut twang, drawl:

Mr. ——, those are very bright children.

Yes, sir. (In the navy on duty one speaks when spoken to by the Admiral, not others.)

They asked a great many very intelligent questions about the ship and the guns.

Yes, sir.

And they'll go home and tell their parents all about it.

No, sir, I don't think so.

Why not? Why don't you think so?

Because they're orphans, Admiral.

The "old man" turned on his heel and walked aft and looked over the rail for a while. Then he turned to the companion hatch and descended toward his cabin. When half way down he stopped and addressing the officer of the deck, said, "Come here, Mr. ——."

The officer of the deck went aft for the blowing up he expected and got it, for the "old man," with a twinkle in his eye, said: "Mr. ——, I don't allow even officers on my staff to talk to me like that."

But he often told the story on himself afterward.

NAVAL OFFICER.

NEW YORK, February 20.

Euphues on Winslow Homer.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Will you ask "R" of Roselle Park, wherever that may be, if the homogeneity of Winslow Homer's work affects the subconscious lucidity of our inadept vision of his correlative values and if the superseriousness of his indefatigability lends an aura of intensity to the universal spirit of unpremeditated occultism to his achievement in the psychological field of this appreciatory science of orderism? The thing that is keeping me awake nights is: Has some one committed the sad crime of adjusting the indifferential value of Homer's work to the cosmopolitan and purely allegorical provision of its superabundant coloeriticism?

NEW YORK, February 18. ART STUDENT.

ART IN PHILADELPHIA.

Second Notice.

Henry James has said, speaking of Ibsen, that it is dangerous to demand of an author why he selected such and such a theme for treatment. "We shall always do well," continues Mr. James, "to leave that matter to the author (he may have some secret for solving the riddle); so terrible would his revenge easily become if we were to accept a responsibility for his theme." Equally futile it seems to us is that critical attitude toward art, and, for that matter, toward life, which spies out the imperfection of a canvas or a marble and suggests as a remedy for shortcomings the substitution of a quality totally foreign to the work in question and an impossibility for its assumption by the creator of that work. We mean that when a confirmed realist appears we usually set to wishing there was a streak of idealism in his makeup, using these two cant phrases "realism" and "idealism" on their face value, forgetting that the artist's major virtue would thereby be attenuated. An artist must stand or fall by his faults as well as by his excellences; following the principle that a rope is only as strong as its weakest part, and often the feeblest strands are the most significant—at least in art. Of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts exhibition now in progress in Philadelphia it would be unfair to say that there are 375 canvases and 148 sculptures all worth while. Mediocrity is the backbone of any art exhibition; a gallery full of masterpieces gives one a spiritual indigestion.

The day we spent in the Pennsylvania Academy was entertainingly punctuated by the advent of sundry art students, and the way they splashed the pictures of their betters was irresistibly comical. No professional critic would ever dare to think, much less to print, the remarks of these roving bands. Sometimes they hit the nail on the head; in the majority of cases their arrows, rather let us say verbal brickbats, went astray. In this desultory criticism we detected a foundation inquiry: Why did the painter or sculptor select this or that as a subject, and why did he perform his task in the manner he did? It is a fundamental habit of the mind to put such questions, and not peculiar to the critical tribe. Why, for instance, does Robert Henri paint differently from, say, William M. Paxton? According to our notion it would be best to take a hint from Mr. James, and not to probe too deeply into the reason why a painter prefers still life to landscape. He might call you a fool, and then you couldn't answer him at all.

In the 375 canvases at Philadelphia there are painters looking at the world and giving us an idea of it. Some of them peep through other painters' spectacles, but that is an immemorial custom more honored in the observance than in the breach. There is Walter MacEwen, for example, whose "At the Window" eloquently proclaims its descent from Vermeer. Yet it is good art all the same. And scattered throughout the galleries you come across little Weirs, Hassams, Lawsons, Chases, Doughertys, De Camps, Pearsons, Tarbells, and a lot of other modern masters. It's diverting and it's stimulating to see young ducks paddling like the old ones; later, if they have stuff in them, they will seek a new part of the pond and educate their own progeny. But mimicry is one of the essentials in the study of the seven arts.

Let us look at some of the exhibits we failed to report after our initial trip around the galleries. In Gallery A the familiar names of Lydia Field Emmet, Paul Dougherty, Cecilia Beaux, Redfield and others meet the eye. Miss Emmet is, as usual, ingratiating in her presentation of two children, "Playmates," and we could wish that her work was as sincere as that of Elizabeth Sparhawk Jones, did we not remember in time that we are debarred from making such vain comparisons. Miss Emmet loves gorgeous textures; Miss Sparhawk Jones deals with more intimate realities, the red cheeks of a child, the rhythm of a nurse girl's walk, and the expression of a winter's day in the park. So let us not follow the example of the art students, and confuse intellectual (or artistic) substances. Miss Beaux's portraits must be both a despair and a delight to painters when she is at her best. John W. Beatty, art director of the Carnegie Institute, Pittsburg, paints as well as he gets up an exhibition. His landscape "Chiltonville" is well balanced in composition and the color scale is admirable. The icy perfections of Paxton's "The Housemaid" at first appal, so does his "New Necklace"; but what a compensation is his technique! Here is a man who in private life is temperamental, human, who in his art is remotely objective. It is not fair to call such art photographic; there is too much skill of a superior kind in his work. Dare we wish him to become like Monticelli (we know of no more complete antipodes in style)? Or hadn't we better admire the wonderful skill of this Andrea del Sarto of Boston (Sarto in the faultless sense, not the color or the manner), who dreams of Vermeer and Tarbell but awakens to find himself still Paxton?

Sometimes Howard Gardiner Cushing takes a day off and finds a new model, but presto! and he returns to the sun kissed hair of his favorite study. Really, you can't blame him. And here's Philip L. Hale, painting with more than his accustomed skill and brio. His portraits and interiors always charm. Wilton Lockwood's "Peonies" still bloom as they bloomed at the Winter Academy, as they bloomed at Washington. We praised early in the winter the promise displayed in the work of Frank A. Nankivell, a young Australian painter. His "Landing Dock" and "The Picnickers" look well amid so many mighty men from the St. Botolph Club. A modest and sincere landscape by Robert Spencer is in the south corridor. So are those wonderfully clever ducks in a marsh by Joseph T. Pearson, Jr. "The Visit" by Susan Watkins is a valued friend. In Gallery B there is a plethora of canvases. We admired Julian Story's magisterial portrait of Charles Custis Harrison as provost of the University of Pennsylvania, though his portrayal of Dr. Samuel G. Dixon is more characteristic. Equal in dignity are the portraits of Walter George Smith by Adolphe Borie and of William Potter by Hugh H. Breckenridge. Cecilia Beaux's representation of Charles L. Taylor and the stately lady by Lazar Raditz are much admired.

Elizabeth Paxton, Elizabeth Nourse, Lillian Westcott Hale, Alice Schille, Martha Walters, Adelaide Cole Chase and Matilde Brownell are in evidence. We wonder how many people stopped to admire that little "Toilet" by John A. Dixon, heavy in tonalities, yet real and full of unassuming talents. Irving R. Wiles is here, and John C. Johansen. In the central corridor we encounter Edward Dufner, Jonas Lie, Colin Campbell Cooper, Robert Reid, W. W. Gilchrist, Potthast, Morris Molarsky, a painter of subtle tonalities; Pearson's striking "Pheasant Hunters," and Frederick J. Waugh's "Roaring Main," a stunning canvas. We did not exhaust the possibilities of Gallery F in our previous mention of its beauties. There Weir, Pearson, Frieseke, Tarbell, Redfield, De Camp, Garber, Schofield, Miller, Frank W. Benson, Lawson, Waugh, Jonas Lie, John W. Alexander, Metcalf, Johansen—his reverberating "Spot of Sunlight"—and Mary Cassatt hold forth. Mr. Benson's capital "The Reader" is captivating. Carl Newman displays mastery in his handling of nudes, "Japaneserie" and "The Red Slippers," though he evokes memories of the palettes of Renoir and Besnard. But clever! Maxfield Parrish's decorative pictures are in the north transept and Louis D. Vaillant's "Woodland Play," with its suggestion of an Ingres nude. Tarbell's "Interior," a sensation at the Corcoran Gallery; Emil Carlsen's admirable "Ripening Corn," several Hassams, Weir's "Flower Girl" and George De Forest Brush's portrait of a lady are in Gallery G. In the adjoining Gallery F are "The Polo Game" of George Bellows, an Italian image vender "Marco" by Murray Bewley, Robert Henri's "The Ancient Dress" and "Rika," also his characteristic head of a fishmonger. May Wilson Preston calls her contribution "An Arrangement." This is both witty and the actual truth. The canvas is easily the most audacious in the exhibition, audacious to the vanishing point of realism. It would have pleased Toulouse-Lautrec because of its forthright fidelity. A woman dressing faces a mirror, nothing more. The motive is not as simple as it seems, and Mrs. Preston shows considerable courage and surety of brush in the way she attacks the problem. It is decidedly better than her interior shown at the exhibition of the Independents in this city several seasons ago. Sergeant Kendall's nude "Cicada," also shown in the Corcoran Gallery, is in the north corridor. P. Vinton's portrait of the Hon. Charles G. Washburn is a sterling characterization.

In Gallery E we paused admiringly before Charles W. Hawthorne's "Morning Chocolate," one of the skilfullest productions from his ever skilful but often mannered brush. Thomas Eakins, a Chase still life, a distinguished portrait by Weir, Woodbury's picturesque "Cliff," Paul Dougherty, Martha Walter, William Sartain's "Hills," Fred Wagner's "Along Darby Creek," Thomas Anschutz's portrait study in red, white and red, and Schofield's "March Sunlight" do not exhaust the list of meritorious works. The sculpture is of such merit that you wonder why there are no prizes or medals awarded the gifted young men and women who exhibit in the Pennsylvania Academy. Charles Grafly's head of the painter Redfield and his two fanciful heads arrest attention because of their genuine power of conception and delicacy in modelling. Calder's "Laughing Boy" and his "Woman" are here. Konti, Lukeman, Bessie Potter Vonnoh, Abastenia St. Leger Eberle's winning "Windy Doorstep," H. Würth, a very natural baby's head; Mahoni Young's working folk, not unlike in feeling to Meunier; John Flanagan's strong head of the late Monsignor Doane, and his medals; Bela L. Pratt's charming study, Beatrice Fenton's promising portrait study, simple in feeling and treatment—she is a Grafly pupil—portraits by Edith Woodman Burroughs, the lovely "Tristesse" by James Earle Fraser, a Rodin evocation; compositions by the accomplished Theodore Spicer-Simson, animals by Harvey, Grace Johnson, Deming, Hartley and Laessele's "The Blue Eyed Lizard," and R. Hinton Perry's "Prometheus," shown a season ago at our Academy. Portrait busts of President Taft, Colonel Roosevelt and Dr. Moncure Conway by Robert I. Aitken, James Earl Fraser and Theodore Spicer-Simson respectively are on view. Praise must be awarded Enid Vandell for her decorative "The Water and the Flowers," and Mrs. Burroughs for her sympathetic bronze portrait of John Bigelow.

A Proposal to Test the Sincerity of the Suffragettes.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Sara McPike seems to be obsessed with the idea that there is some connection between lack of health and lack of suffrage. If we believe what she seems to want us to, it would appear that the reason why women have nervous exhaustion, anæmia or tuberculosis is because they are not allowed to vote! Can any logic or reasoning be more puerile than that? How about the men who have those diseases and suffrage too? If 6,000,000 women are sick because they can't vote and as many men are sick in spite of the fact that they can, what, I implore, will be the horrible condition of womankind when the burden of the ballot is added to that of the diseases?

It is sheer nonsense to claim that beneficent legislation is dependent upon female suffrage. Already without it we have quantities of laws designed for the proper preservation of the public health and the safeguarding of the welfare, morals and rights of young and old, rich and poor, male and female; but it is, as every thinking person very well knows, in the enforcement of those laws that difficulty exists and wrongs and injustices continue. If the women who are shouting for suffrage only would realize it, they are like a misguided philanthropist who would expect to help a hungry child by giving it candy to take away its appetite.

The Consumers League in striving for the enforcement of our laws is doing very good work in the direction of practical aid to women and children. Now if the "votes for women" advocates are as much in earnest in their efforts on behalf of their sex and as altruistic as they profess to be, I will set them a test by which their sincerity, which I greatly doubt, may be proved. Let each of them make the three pledges I suggest and keep them. I don't mean the kind of thing with which, we are told, the way to Hades is paved, but genuine resolves, binding and not to be lightly or occasionally disregarded; pledges to be kept scrupulously in the face of difficulties, inconveniences and discouragements, as follows:

First—Not to wear, use, buy or eat any article unless it is prepared, produced, made or sold in accordance with requirements or recommendations of the Consumers League.

Second—Not to patronize any store except those on the "white list" of the league.

Third—Not to buy in any store after 4.30 P. M., except in case of absolute necessity, foodstuffs or medicines, and not to buy in any store for any reason whatever on Sundays or holidays.

If those who believe in woman suffrage will make and keep these three vows, honestly and truly, they will convert even a sceptic like me to a belief in their sincerity, which is now non-existent, and they can enroll me and my best efforts under their banner. FLORA C. S. HAZARD.

NEW YORK, February 20.

The Seventh Avenue Line.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The present routing or, better, lack of routing of the Seventh avenue car line is unfortunate both for the public and for the bondholders of the Metropolitan company.

The present line runs from Jefferson Market at Eighth street to Central Park. Between these points the Pennsylvania Station alone would supply adequate business for a car line that went somewhere.

Upon the opening of the Pennsylvania Station the operating officials of the road put eight wheel pay as you enter cars on Seventh avenue. The results were unsatisfactory. Should some of the Amsterdam avenue cars be run down Seventh avenue and across Fourteenth street to the East Side the line would draw a large patronage, first from the travel from the West Side to the Pennsylvania Station, and secondly from the army of factory workers of the new loft section who now walk to and from the East Side on account of the fact that no direct means of transportation is furnished.

Does this situation exist simply by reason of lack of initiative or for some more obscure reason?

WILBER C. GOODALE.

NEW YORK, February 20.

MOUNTS FOR THE ARMY.

Mr. August Belmont Shows How the Stallions He Offers Could Be Used.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* An editorial in THE SUN of February 15 criticises my gift of thoroughbred stallions to the United States army as impracticable, first, because you state the army cannot accept them, secondly, because the army having no breeding farms, it would be unable to use them.

As you did not quote the text of my remarks at the sportsmen's dinner on the evening of February 15 your readers would have to infer that I offered my horses in the manner you intimate, that is to say, to be used by the army on its own breeding farms and with its own mares, and this statement does not conform to the facts. I quote from my remarks at the sportsmen's dinner:

I hope the army will be able to obtain many good thoroughbred stallions and place them throughout the West as our Jockey Club's breeding bureau has distributed them in this State, and by securing first call on the mares bred to its stallions it will be able to inaugurate a practical way of procuring the type of horse so much needed and which the army has so much difficulty in obtaining.

The first statement in your editorial is answered by the fact that I learned to-day when passing through Washington that the Adjutant-General had decided that the law did not prohibit their acceptance and that consequently they would be accepted.

My suggestions are amplified in the accompanying letter addressed by me to General Leonard Wood on February 16, which, if you will print it, is an answer to the mistake into which your editorial falls and may be of practical use in solving this problem, which, I am pleased to observe, you seem to agree is in need of solution.

AUGUST BELMONT.

ON BOARD SEABOARD AIR LINE, February 18.

MY DEAR GENERAL WOOD: Captain Cassatt is going on to Washington and will explain to you the nature of my offer of stallions to the army. I had intended conveying it with a letter covering my views on the subject of the value of the thoroughbred, but the sportsmen's dinner last night offered an occasion which I thought perhaps was better, and I enclose to you a newspaper clipping which gives my remarks in full.

With regard to the stallions, Henry of Navarre and Octagon are at my French stud, and I am having them shipped to America by the earliest steamer. The other stallions I am not prepared at the moment to name, as I have to wait for the racing season to pass before I can fix definitely upon those which I think best to give. I wish to offer horses of merit and not castoffs. There would be no advantage in that for your purpose. The reputation of a horse is important, so that breeders with whom the army may make arrangements will be inclined to take the risks should the foals not meet with the requirements your inspectors might feel they should possess.

My thought has been that very advantageous use could be made of stallions by the army without much cost by arranging a contract with an owner of a mare which would provide the right of the army to buy the colt on a fixed basis, or abandon its possession to the owner of the mare. In this way some twenty or thirty stallions would produce nearly three or four hundred foals, or even 500, a year, from which in time wise selection could be made.

With regard to the services I propose to place at the disposal of the army I attach no conditions, inasmuch as I do not quite understand what facilities you may have; but I talked the matter over with Captain Cassatt this morning with a view to explaining to you what might possibly be done. I realize that to confine the service to mares either belonging to the army or officers of the army might miss carrying out the purpose, and therefore I would, in any arrangement you desire, include the right of the army to nominate the mares to be bred to my stallions under contracts somewhat similar to those you would make for your own stallions.

I hope this step may be of some assistance in your campaign for recognition by the Government of your urgent needs. Always at your disposal and desiring to do anything that lies within my power to help in what we all consider a common necessity, I remain, yours very sincerely,

AUGUST BELMONT.

NEW YORK, February 16.

RECEIVING BY WIRELESS.

Successes Which Prove That Elevated Antennæ Are Not Necessary.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Articles have appeared recently in the newspapers relating to the use of bedposts and umbrellas for "antennæ." The wireless telegraph people use and expend large sums of money to erect poles or towers to which wires are attached for the purpose of sending and receiving the "waves." It is considered necessary to have an "earth" connection for the efficient sending or receiving of messages or signals.

I have been experimenting with wireless receiving apparatus for two years or more for the purpose of determining the most efficient "detector." The detector is the soul of the receiving set. The other essentials are a tuning coil, a condenser or condensers, and an "earth" or ground connection. The "antennæ" or aerial wires are arranged in various ways upon towers or poles and connected with the receiving set of instruments. Two years ago during a windstorm my antennæ were disarranged. While engaged in straightening up the poles my wires, about 1,000 feet of No. 14 naked copper, were laid irregularly as they fell upon the wet grass. I went into the house while my men were straightening the poles up, and as an experiment I threw my switches over to receive, when to my great astonishment I received signals from a station fifty miles away. This statement is on record in an office on Park row. The record was sent very soon after the above described occurrence.

I saw an article in THE SUN on "Wireless for Railroads." I thought I would make some tests and did so, with the following interesting results: I received signals from O H X and T W T last night without "earth" connections. These New York stations are ninety miles from this place. I received signals from two steamers on Long Island Sound which were ten or more miles from my station. The antennæ were disconnected and the ground was disconnected. I used a single slide tuning coil, a 006 microfarad condenser and a "Perikon" detector, which is standard in the navy.

It is possible to receive signals through or from limited distances without the use of extensive highly elevated wires and without the use of a ground connection.

JO