The Sun.

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1912.

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 daily, including Sunday, by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer, William C. Reick, 170 Nassau street; Vice-President, Edward P. Mitchell, 170 Nassau street; Secretary, Chester S. Lord, 170 Nassau street.

London office, Effingham House, 1 Arundel street, Strand.
Paris office, 6 Rue de la Michodière, off Rue du Quatre Septembre.
Washington office, Hibbs Building.
Brooklyn office, 106 Livingston street.

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.

Colonel Roosevelt Answered and Rebuked by His Most Admired Friend.

We have printed the conclusive reply made to Colonel ROOSEVELT'S argument for a Bench of the Whole Crowd by his old and firm friend Senator LODGE of Massachusetts.

We now reproduce some remarks on the same subject by Colonel ROOSEVELT'S Secretary of State and his most trusted adviser during the two terms to which he has pledged himself to limit his personal ambition. Speaking as president of the New York Bar Association the Hon. ELIHU ROOT said in this town only five weeks ago:

"I must believe that proposals, in whatever form, to subordinate the decisions of the courts to the decisions of a popular majority, whether it be by punishing the Judges for an unsatisfactory decision through removing them from office or by reviewing their decisions at the polls as distinct from reviewing and revising the law upon which they are to decide, proceed from a failure to realize that this involves an abandonment of the most essential feature of our system of constitutional government."

"A sovereign people which declares that all men have certain inalienable rights and imposes upon itself the great impersonal rules of conduct deemed necessary for the preservation of those rights, and at the same time declares that it will disregard those rules whenever in any particular case it is the wish of a majority of its voters to do so, establishes as complete a contradiction to the fundamental principles of our Government as it is possible to conceive."

Senator ROOT said more, but this ought to be enough for Colonel ROOSEVELT. The dignified rebuke comes to him from one whose wisdom he respects and whose political advice he will scarcely dismiss with a horse laugh. It comes from the man of whom Colonel ROOSEVELT has said: "ELIHU ROOT is the ablest man I have known in our Government service. I will go further. He is the greatest man that has appeared in the public life of any country, in any position, on either side of the ocean, in my time."

The Bombardment of Beirut.

However subsequent despatches may increase or diminish the early estimates of the destruction of life reported at Beirut as a consequence of the Italian bombardment, it can be no exaggeration to say that the action itself will arouse the indignation and the apprehension of the whole civilized world. The indignation will come as a natural consequence of the bombardment of a commercial town lacking all naval importance and destitute of all military resource. The apprehension will be awakened by the well founded dread that this aggression of a Christian nation will set on fire the fanaticism of the Moslem population of Asia Minor.

In all European or Asiatic Turkey it is hard to find a single town whose misfortune would appeal more promptly than that of Beirut to the world at large. For Americans the Syrian Protestant College, one of the two great educational institutions of the near East, a monument to the Rev. DANIEL BLISS, its founder, who is still living, and a splendid example of the intelligent munificence of this country, is sufficient to provoke protest and command concern. But France, Germany and Great Britain have also citizens and commercial enterprises there which deserve and will doubtless immediately receive their protection.

Beirut itself is a Christian city. Of its 200,000 inhabitants less than a third are followers of the Prophet, and the communicants of the Greek Church alone outnumber the Mohammedans. How grave the daily danger of this Christian population is may be gathered from the fact that a large number are themselves the survivors and descendants of the survivors of the great massacres of 1860, which attracted the attention of Europe to the unhappy state of Christian inhabitants of Syria.

The explanation of the Italian action may perhaps be found in the political necessities at home, its justification will be harder to discern. With a Parliament newly assembled and the Tripolitan annexation under debate the value of some cheap and sensational "victory" as an accelerating influence to national spirit and sidewalk patriotism is plain. Yet even here the subsequent serious consequences should have been considered by the Government.

The bombardment of Beirut is the last in a long series of Italian actions which have roused the criticism and disapproval of the great Powers. The descent upon Tripoli at the outset cost Italy the approval of much of British public opinion. The severity of Italian treatment of Turkish and Arab prisoners stirred new protest in the nation which has always been a friend to Italy. Germany and Russia, for selfish reasons, perhaps, yet with unmistakable unanimity, condemned the attack upon Tripoli which Germans described as a piece of brigandage.

As for France, the Manouba incident, the seizure of the Carthage and the long and unsatisfactory negotiations that followed cost Italy the sympathy of the one nation which viewed its African adventure with real sympathy. Since then the destruction of the French railroad at Hodeida has roused new protest. As for the Beirut incident, France has here not only missionaries to protect but a great financial interest, since the railroad connecting Beirut with Damascus and the interior is owned by a French company.

It is easy to forget the Italian difficulties. The threatening attitude of Austria and Russia prevents her from attacking European Turkey, where the slightest disturbance might provoke a Balkan uprising. An attack upon the Turkish coast or islands in the Ægean would instantly open the Cretan question. Operations in the Red Sea are halted by British and French hostility, since land operations so near Mecca might set the whole Mohammedan world from the Philippines to Gibraltar in flame. As for Tripoli, climate and country alike combine to baffle the greatest efforts of Italian soldiers.

Yet even these obvious embarrassments will hardly check the criticism of the bombardment of Beirut, and if it excites Mohammedan reprisal it is difficult to foresee what the effect may be upon the Turco-Italian war and to what lengths of intervention Europe may be moved. As it stands, in the present state of the evidence, the bombardment of Beirut must appear as a violation of the most elementary conventions of civilized warfare and as an aggression deserving the reprobation of all the nations whose citizens have been thereby placed in gravest peril.

The Cloud in Cuba.

The decision of the Supreme Court in Cuba declaring the law suspending the civil service act and permitting the exclusion of "guerrillas" from office to be unconstitutional was to be expected. It was not wise to try civil service on the Cuban people, or rather to compel them to accept the system. The employment of Spaniards in office was sure to breed trouble, and when the old voluntario or guerrilla element insinuated itself into the public service there was bound to be an explosion.

The bad blood between the native Cubans and the Peninsulars is a historic fact. For scorn hatred was returned; but deeper and blacker than hatred was the feeling that Cubans nursed for the "voluntarios," Peninsular and native, who took up arms for Spain in the rebellions that devastated the island. That there was retaliation for excesses is undeniable, but the excesses were horrible in cowardly ferocity. Mr. ANTONIO GALLENGA, a British journalist who visited the island in 1873 with instructions to study slavery and describe the revolt of that time, reported that no feudal antipathy he had encountered in Europe was as fierce and relentless as the animosity that existed between the native Cuban and the ruling Spaniard, and worst of all was the Cuban's undying and inarticulate hatred of the hired guerrilla. GALLENGA verified many of the guerrilla's shocking deeds of violence.

Hundreds of thousands of Cubans are still living who remember the atrocities of the guerrillas in the rebellions of 1868-78 and 1896-98. It was too much to expect of flesh and blood that the native Cubans would look with complacence, or even tolerance, upon the holding of office to their own exclusion by either the Peninsular volunteer or the guerrilla. The decision of the Supreme Court will reinstate the ancient and odious enemy. It is said that the Veterans Association has renewed the agitation which provoked a note of warning from the American State Department. The association may be controlled by politicians more or less unscrupulous, but there is no doubt they have an inflammable issue to work with. Possibly the Washington Government does not fully understand this. Unless it uses its influence with President GOMEZ to have the festering sore healed there will be another crisis before long.

The Police of Paris.

Statistics which supply an admirable opportunity to compare the police force of Paris with that of this city both as to numbers, organization and pay are furnished by an official report which has just been published in the French capital. Needless to say the local policeman will find nothing unfavorable in the comparison of his lot with that of his Parisian brother in clubs.

Rank and file included the Paris police force counts 8,000 men for a city of slightly less than 3,000,000. New York, with just under 5,000,000 people, has 10,136. Of the French force 7,000 are of the rank corresponding to New York patrolmen and 880 of the next rank, which corresponds to sergeant here. Of the balance sixty are brigadiers, comparable with lieutenants, twenty-eight inspectors and twenty-five officers. There are thus 123 officers above a sergeant in the French force. The number in this city is 724, or a little less than six times as large.

The pay of the French patrolman (gardien de la paix) ranges from $400 to $520, with an additional clothing allowance of $36.75 annually, against $800 to $1,400 here; that of the sergeant (sous brigadier) ranges from $540 to $560, against $1,750 locally; that of the brigadier $600 to $620, against $2,750 for New York captains.

In Paris as in New York the policeman can retire upon half pay after twenty-five years of service, and the Frenchman can count his time in the army. Retirement for physical disability on a proportionally smaller pension is possible after ten years of service, and on application after fifteen years. After twenty years of service, the last five without punishment, the Parisian policeman gets a medal which brings $10 a year extra pay.

As in New York, all grades and ranks are open to the Paris policeman, but in the French capital the competition is much more severe and the posts far less numerous in proportion to the size of the department. Having passed all tests the Paris sergeant must undergo a further trial of from one to two years before he is finally comissioned.

The organization of the Paris department corresponds roughly to that here. The force is divided into twenty-five companies, twenty of which are distributed among the civil divisions of the town and five are held in reserve at the Prefecture. The reserves are used in any emergency, at any public gathering or celebration and to reenforce a company in a dangerous district in case of riot. They also furnish details for balls, concerts and races, and one company has charge of the carriage traffic of the city.

Thus the conditions of service of the French policemen are far more severe than those of the New York bluecoat, the pay but a third or a half, and the openings for advance immeasurably smaller. Yet the ranks are always full and the applications indicate the attraction the service has for Frenchmen.

A Second Lesson in Romantic Political Economy.

Just a week ago THE SUN lingered lovingly over this proposition in the lectures of a distinguished sociologist, the Hon. ORRIN T. COCKS, on the political economy of marriage:

"Two dollars a month must be allowed for amusements and church expenses."

Forbid it, heaven, that we should disturb the equilibrium of any domestic budget, if any has been balanced in these difficult days, according to the prescription of Dr. COCKS, but $2 a month for amusements and church seems mighty short commons. Would not the church contribution be likely to suffer? Will young women be lured toward the married condition by the prospect of only a part of $2 a month for amusements? Or is marriage to be regarded as a duty or a discipline whereto young women, after their peep at or fill of musical and theatrical matinées and nights, are to march sadly, leaving all fun behind?

Great is the doubt of many honest doubters; and greater must it be since Mr. COCKS, at the Rockefeller Bible Class Friday night, painted the fair and unexpressive she that he prefers:

"I am inclined to the somewhat old fashioned view that the girl to marry is one who takes an interest in the things of the intellect, one who won't go to sleep when you take her to a high class play containing an idea, who enjoys grand opera and the Philharmonic concerts."

It is too well known that most men, with the modesty of their breed, regard themselves as provided with more than enough intellect for the family, for SOLOMON'S family, if you go to that; and small chance of marriage has a girl with intellect unless she hides it carefully from the lord of creation, which she will if her humor gets the better of her contempt. Intellect, too, might pine for books and things and so throw the romantic balance sheet into worse disorder. But there is trouble enough without that. Will Mr. COCKS put hand on heart and explain with a wink, if he can, how you're going to get along on $2 a month for amusements and church expenses when you've married a girl brought up on high class plays, grand opera and the Philharmonic?

A Deed of Shame in Missouri.

No wonder the Missouri Democrats are yelling the Ozark Houn' Dawg and State Democratic anthem till the heaven and their voices split. Under cover of this artificial tumult the most arch act of savage wrong is being committed against the most renowned citizen of Missouri, a man who is known and loved from Magnet to Cottonplant and from Jane to Black Jack. Will it be believed in the East that the Democrats of St. Louis are trying to disfranchise Colonel ABE SLUPSKY, the father of school reform, a Colonel by birth, fitness, service and universal brevet when some now rival Colonels were cutting coral—the beautiful, the chivalrous, the high souled ABE SLUPSKY? Colonel ABE SLUPSKY'S vote has been challenged on the most brutal of technicalities, "because the election clerk recording his name omitted some part of the information provided for in the forms drawn up by a former Board of Election Commissioners."

If this lamentable outrage, flagrant in its defiance of right and justice, is consummated, Colonel ABE SLUPSKY may indeed be robbed of his vote; he cannot be robbed of the votes of his fellow citizens eager to defend one of the earliest and the best of the practical thinkers and workers of Missouri. Colonel ABE SLUPSKY is not the man to throw his hat or his head into the ring; but if the people of Missouri call him he is a patriot and will respond.

NASHVILLE, Tenn., Feb. 24.—Governor WOODROW WILSON of New Jersey is in Nashville to-day. * * * Between 10 and 12 o'clock Governor WILSON met members of the Woodrow Wilson Club.—*Yesterday's Evening Post.*

The path of duty is the way to glory.

ASQUITH buys coal.—*Headline.*
Another victory for LLOYD GEORGE.

The Madrid despatch to THE SUN announcing that France has asked Spain to cede to her the hamlet of Cabo de Agua, or Cap de l'Eau, as it is more commonly designated on the maps, reveals a final attempt on the part of the French to obtain a Moroccan port on the Mediterranean. Between Oran in Algeria and Spanish Melilla, Cap de l'Eau is the only port having access to the interior by a valley which would permit the construction of a railroad into the hinterland. Cap de l'Eau is at present a mere roadstead, but it is well protected by the Zafferine Islands and is just west of the mouth of the Muluya, which opens a way both to Fez and to the south of Morocco and the Sahara. A railroad from Cap de l'Eau to Fez would be at least a half shorter than the line from Oran to the Moroccan capital, which is the only alternative. But as Cap de l'Eau in French hands would rob Melilla of practically its entire commercial value, the chance that Spain will cede it to France is plainly slight.

No man should receive a dollar unless that dollar has been fairly earned. Every dollar received should represent a dollar's worth of service rendered.—*The Columbus Bis.*

There will have to be commissions or courts of merit to decide whether a man has earned and is earning every dollar of his money and has given exact consideration of service therefor. Many delicate questions will come before these tribunals. Was every dollar of an inherited fortune fairly earned? Is every dollar earned that is paid to the Pen for contributing editorials and other articles in a non-English dialect?

DICKENS AS A READER.

He Was Also a Great Actor and a Gifted Preacher.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I heard Charles Dickens read in Steinway Hall in 1868. I accompanied my teacher, Professor William Cleaver Wilkinson, and two or three of my schoolmates about my age, 17. Possibly the impression Dickens made on me is of interest, though I cannot recall definitely the two selections given, because since then I seem to hear his voice in every dramatic passage of his I read.

His personal appearance was somewhat repugnant to me. I disliked his "vest" of velvet and the heavy gold chain across it from pocket to pocket. I compared his attire to that of my father, so unobtrusive, not considering that the latter was a mere mercantile man, who wore a high hat to business, as did other merchants then. In fact, I was at first much disappointed, for I expected to see and hear what was more than a mere man. When the reading, however, was well under way, I found myself laughing and sobbing. The latter surprised and irritated me much. It was the first time I had cried in public and I tried to quell my tears, but in vain. So Dickens sustained the test of tears grudgingly evoked from his hearer.

I feel that I am not completely incompetent to judge his reading because I have witnessed since then the following great actors, some of them several times: Edwin Forrest (I remember his mouth frothing literally) in "King Lear"; Miss Cushman, the grand effect of her voice and arms as *Queen Katharine*; Edwin Booth, the flash of his eyes in "Richelieu"; Adelaide Neilson, her radiant smile in "Romeo and Juliet," Act II., scene 5, and Clara Morris, with her Celtic wail, direct from remote ages.

And I have also witnessed two great preachers, Henry Ward Beecher and Bishop Simpson. I was sorry when their sermons ended, much to my amazement. Here let me mention that though only 17 years old when I heard Dickens read I had listened to over 600 sermons, mostly by a varied assortment of Methodist divines, and Dickens was the only one that made me cry.

So I am sure he was a great reader, actor and preacher, deftly blended in all he rendered. The output of the man was a largess of the gods to us poor mortals.

CHAUNCEY K. BUCHANAN.

TARRYTOWN, February 23.

ANOTHER LIFE.

Conclusions of a Student of Human Affairs.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* People who say that they would not be willing to live their lives over again if they got the chance deceive themselves. For the proposition would really be this: to live or to die? No man not unbalanced mentally would hesitate as to which of these alternatives to accept, for it is natural to cling to life. We see the poor chronic invalid smile when his doctor gives him a word of hope; and we see the prisoner condemned to death rejoice when he hears that his sentence has been commuted to penal servitude for life.

However, in deciding to live his life over again if he could, a man would be a fool, for he would be rejecting or at least postponing something very much better, and that is if not a happy state after death at least eternal peace. The idea of dissolution is terrible mainly because we do not know what lies beyond it. Shakespeare expressed this when he said:

> * * * the dread of something after death,
> The undiscovered country from whose bourn
> No traveller returns, puzzles the will
> And makes us rather bear those ills we have
> Than fly to others that we know not of.

Now, of course, we do not know absolutely that we shall live hereafter, but I think we may reasonably conclude that we shall, that we shall have another chance, as the saying is. If not, what were the use of life? It would be most inconsequential and meaningless. For man's efforts on this planet, his material efforts, that is, really amount to nothing. We see all the grandeur of ancient Greece and Rome crumbled to dust, beyond them Babylon, Nineveh, Thebes; and we can well believe that our skyscrapers also will crumble to dust.

What then? Why was man created? If for nothing more than to play pretty much as children do with sand and pebbles on the seashore his creation would show a strange lack of wisdom in the great Originator of things, and not only that but a strange wantonness and cruelty. But such an idea is unthinkable.

We may therefore, I say, reasonably conclude, quite apart from religious teaching, that we shall live hereafter, that we shall go on and on, ever progressing toward perfection and happiness. Let those who are laboring under the burdens of old age console themselves with this reflection, let them not waste their time in vain regrets over vanished youth and its joys, but look forward believing that there is something infinitely better than all that in store for them.

STRINUS.

NEW YORK, February 24.

SPAIN'S BEAUTIFUL FLAG.

A Banner That Unites the Essentials in Distinguished Simplicity.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In any discussion of the rank in beauty of the flags of the nations no American should attempt to compare those of other nations with that under which he lives. The personal appeal, the personal message of the Stars and Stripes must warp his judgment and influence his decision. The best anybody can do is to find among the flags of the world his second choice; and my choice falls on the flag of Spain.

Its colors are bright and martial, easily distinguishable at great distance and boldly outlined as it flies in the breeze. Its arrangement is simple and dignified. The national ships bear an appropriate device which the merchant flag discards. The colors red and yellow harmonize well. They are so arranged as to avoid that complexity of design which detracts from the appearance of many flags. Dignity and valor are fittingly symbolized by this banner, which in my estimation ranks above all others except our own in beauty.

As for the American flag I should doubt the sincerity of the man who, sheltered beneath its protecting folds, could assign to it any except first place. It is more than a mere bit of bunting, and the American who fails to be inspired by it is unfit to pass judgment on any subject.

ELIAS SOMERS.

WATERTOWN, N. Y., February 22.

A Chance to Do Good in Alaska.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It is to-morrow the first day of the new year, and I think of the thousands and thousands of dollars spent to make presents more or less useful. Ah, if I could have a little share and my little present!

I have here three children, a girl and two boys, deaf and dumb. We have no means here to educate them properly. A very good institution in California is ready to do that without charge, but the travelling expenses, &c., will amount to about $400 or $500, and I have only $10 so far. Will you please help me to save these poor little Eskimos? With that money, what a great good could be accomplished! What a great change, aye, a new life could be wrought, almost created in these little souls!

You know so many rich and generous people. You have so many means to get some help. But we, lost in this icy, dark solitude, can do nothing. Hoping in your generous heart that you will not abandon my poor little Eskimos, I wish you a very happy new year and many more for the future.

SUPERIOR OF HOLY CROSS MISSION.

KOSEREFSKY, Alaska, December 31, 1911.

NOVELETTES OF THIS TIME.

The Week-Hour at Trenton.

In his triumphal progress as a Presidential candidate the Governor of New Jersey has been forced to give up his week end at the Capitol. Speaking dates have made it necessary to reduce his official time to a week-hour.

"At what minute may I confer with his Excellency?" asked a Senator.

"I am very sorry," replied the private secretary, "but there are only four minutes left open on his calendar. The other fifty-six have already been filled. You see he arrives from Kickapoo, Kansas, at 2:57 and he is due to start for Biddeford Pool at 3:01. What is it you wish to see him about?"

"Oh, nothing very important. Merely a change in the State Constitution. It will only take a moment to settle it."

"Have you the amendment ready so that I may place it with the other papers to be signed? If so, that will relieve the necessity for a personal conference, and a hasty glance will suffice. Hark! I hear the Executive motor now."

The secretary left the Senator conversing with himself, for not a minute was to be lost. In a twinkling the classic composite features made their appearance, smiling cordially and sincerely.

"How much I appreciate your coming to see me, Senator."

"You must declare yourself, Governor!" gasped the Senator, letting the constitutional amendment wait upon more essential matters.

"On what must I declare myself?"

"Is your hat in the ring?"

"Yes, when it's not in the baggage car."

"You decline to give a definite answer, then?"

"Thank you so much for urging me, Senator, but I prefer to straddle until I learn just which part of the ring Human Rights has reference to. I have already replied that my hat has been in the ring for a long time and that my head has been in it, but now I fear lest I have committed myself too far as it is."

"Very well, then; but unless you come out squarely I cannot guarantee the sombrero vote. Oh, by the way, here is that constitutional amendment about which I wired you."

"I am really and truly glad to get it. I shall look over its details on my way to the ferry when I return from Dover next month."

"Your minute is more than up, Senator," frowned the secretary cordially.

"It is such a pity we could not have enjoyed a longer conference," said the Governor, smiling, "but you know what Lincoln said about wardrobe trunks? That it is dangerous to try to pack them in the midst of a quick luncheon."

The Senator took the hint and departed.

"Has my grip been unpacked and repacked?" asked the Governor.

"Shall I order anything additional to the usual series?" asked the secretary.

"Yes, slip in the recall of the judiciary," said the Governor. "I venture to suggest to myself that my hand may be called now that the Colonel has put that joker in the pack. But still, as La Follette said, we Radicals must play to win or lose."

THE AMERICAN CYCLOPÆDIA.

Positively Last Words on the Subject From Mr. Rossiter Johnson.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I do not understand why there should be any necessity for so much comment on my letter concerning the construction of the American Cyclopædia or why there was need of any comment at all. What I wrote was in no wise derogatory to Mr. Heilprin: on the contrary I gave him high praise. He did what he was employed to do, and did it well. I objected to the mistaken and misleading statement that "the entire work of revision was entrusted to him," which would cause the reader to suppose that no one else had any responsibility in the task.

It is true that Mr. Heilprin handled all the articles. So did I, for that matter, so did Mr. Teall. And, by the way, Mr. Teall, besides being a most skilful proofreader, had a vast store of accurate knowledge, which was in constant requisition. It did not occur to me that it was necessary to add the fact that when the proofs returned from Mr. Heilprin both Dr. Ripley and Mr. Dana went over them, either accepting or rejecting his suggestions as they judged best, which was a matter of course.

One commentator quotes a long passage from the *Nation* of May 17, 1888, which no doubt the writer intended for truth, but it is misleading. One would think, to read it, that there was no one else on the staff who looked out for "uniform spelling of proper names," "uniform date for the same event, however often mentioned," "uniform system of transcribing words from foreign languages," &c. All that was done continually in the office, and if Mr. Heilprin discovered an instance, as sometimes he did, in which it was overlooked, of course he corrected it. So did others of us. Mr. Teall was especially sharp on those things. As for the occasional striking out of part of an article that could be spared, you should have seen Mr. Dana's lightning touch do that. No one else was a circumstance in comparison.

But what is the use of insisting on nice discriminations? That splendid work exhibited credit enough for all who were connected with it. No one man, however learned, can make a dictionary or a cyclopædia that is good for much. You might as well expect one man to build a railroad.

ROSSITER JOHNSON.

NEW YORK, February 23.

The Work of Francis A. Teall.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I have no doubt that Dr. Rossiter Johnson and Mr. Pollak are both correct in what they wrote about the American Cyclopædia and Mr. Heilprin, and I am sure that neither of them intended anything other than strict truth about any one. Dr. Johnson's letter was prompted by an inaccuracy which he did not explicitly correct. He read that "the entire work of revision was entrusted to" Michael Heilprin, and this was very far from the truth, but probably a misstatement intended for the true fact, which is, that practically the whole work was submitted to Mr. Heilprin, who made many changes in it. His son, Louis Heilprin, had proofs of the New International Encyclopædia sent to his home, and never returned a historical article without almost entire rewriting on the margin of the proof. I presume that his work on that was similar to his father's on the American.

Another father was mentioned in the letters and called a prince, but only "prince of proofreaders," Francis A. Teall. Mr. Teall was not simply a proofreader as that term is commonly understood. Being Mr. Teall's son I know that he also did much of the kind of editorial work which was specially credited to Mr. Heilprin, having many articles rewritten under his direction. Father began on the cyclopædia as a mere proofreader, but became an editor on the first edition, and, as Mr. Pollak notes, one of four acknowledged associate editors on the second. It was a singular mark of his standing as proofreader that he was always remembered as such rather than as editor. When I went to Springfield, Mass., as an editor on the Webster's New International Dictionary, in 1904, I soon met Dr. William T. Harris. His first question after introduction was, "Son of the Appleton proofreader?" Unfortunately father never wrote any books or did any work that made him widely known, as he might well have been.

The American Cyclopædia staff included many who were entitled to fully as much credit as any man can be entitled to, with no need to belittle any one of them. Michael Heilprin was certainly one of the best, and his son, Louis, was one of his worthy successors.

F. HORACE TEALL.

GLEN RIDGE, N. J., February 24.

Claudite jam rivos, pueri, sat prata biberunt.

Let us talk of something else.

The Color.

Knicker—Roosevelt says he is stripped to the buff.

Bocker—Or to the yellow?

A PRECISIAN'S PLAINT.

"Racquet" in Its Good Old Unmutilated Shape Grieves His Heart.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Every reader of THE SUN knows that in the matter of simplified spelling that prince of dailies may be said to take its medicine in homœopathic doses. In our community there is a word that is persistently misspelled; that is the word "racket." In THE SUN of to-day I find "Great Racquets, and Fincke Won." That spelling is not to be found in any reputable dictionary to-day; in fact is not to be found in standard literature. Then, pray, why does THE SUN use it?

An examination of the dictionaries from the day of John Kersey to the present time shows that the form "racket" has been consistently used. Kersey in his "Dictionarium Anglo-Britannicum" defines the word "racket": "An instrument to throw the ball with, at tennis play" (1708). Following him Bailey in 1721, spelling it the same way, defined it in the same terms, adding "also a star, a hurly burly, noise or disturbance." Following Bailey came Samuel Johnson (1756), Walker's Dictionary (1828), Webster's Dictionary, the Century and the Standard Dictionary. So much for the lexicographical side; now for the literary.

Chaucer in his "Troylus" iv., 432, dated about 1374, spelled the word "raket." John Lydgate was the first to use the form "racket," about 1430: "To play racket as a chylde channgeable" (see "Bochas," v., xxix., 140); William Dunbar, the poet, gave us a plural form in 1500, "rakketis"; Heywood, in his play "The Four P's," 1540, spelled it "racket" in the singular and "rackettes" in the plural; and in 1574 Sir Isaac Newton in his *Health Magazine* spelled it "raquet." Robert Greene in his "Menaphon," 1589, wrote: "Finding opportunities to glue her both bal and racket." Captain John Smith, writing on Virginia, described the beaver with "a taile somewhat like the forme of a racket," in 1624, and Locke, in his "Human Understanding," referred to "a tennis ball, whether in motion by the stroke of a racket or lying still at rest." Shakespeare preferred the form "racket"; see "Henry V.," act I., sc. 2: "When we have match'd our rackets to these balls," (1600). In Richardson's "Clarissa" (1748) you will find the form "raquet"; Johnston in his "Reverie" (1763) wrote: "He was seated at table with a parcel of shuttlecocks before him and mending a racket"; Sir Walter Scott (1805) preferred "raquet"; Hazlitt, treating the game in his "Table Talk," wrote: "Rackets is, like any other athletic game, very much a thing of skill and practice."

Writers familiar with the game in which rackets are used, such as C. G. Heathcote, author of "A Treatise on Lawn Tennis" (1890), and E. O. P. Bouverie, author of "A Treatise on Rackets" (1890), preferred the "racket" form. See page 208 of the first treatise: "The main object of lawn tennis is to meet the ball with a full racket"; also, see page 359 of the second treatise: "The game of rackets is now exclusively played in a court enclosed in four walls."

Other authors who used the form racket for related terms are: (1) Ogilby, in "Æsop" (1651), "Like racket-bals with Argos, I sport the whole ocean"; (2) Middleton, in "Father Hubbard's Tale" (1604), "I am no day from the line of the racket court"; (3) Cotgreave (1611), "Racquetier, a racket maker"; (4) Dickens, in "Pickwick," chapter 41 (1837), "racket ground," and (5), in *All the Year Round* (1860), No. 66, page 366, "racket court."

As you will see from the foregoing, the preponderance of evidence of usage is in favor of the form "racket" with "raquet" as an alternative, to the exclusion of the form "racquet," which appears to be favored by THE SUN. Why? In the vernacular of Publius Terentius Afer: Dictum sapienti sat est.

DR. SYNTAX.

NEW YORK, February 23.

We are not in the habit of searching the dictionary as if it were the Scriptures, but we have taken the trouble to find "racquet" in the Century, Webster and Standard.

THE HIGH PRESSURE SERVICE.

Growth of New York's Latest Fire Extinguishing Device.

From the City Record.

On December 21, 1911, the Commissioner of Water Supply, Gas and Electricity requested an issue of $1,000,000 in corporate stock to provide means for the extension of the high pressure fire service system in the Borough of Manhattan.

The districts now protected by high pressure service cover an area of 2,221 acres, bounded by the North River, Twenty-third street, Madison avenue, Twenty-fourth street, Lexington avenue and Irving place, Fourteenth street, Bowery, Houston street, East River, Maiden lane, Park row and Chambers street. These districts are known as Districts Numbers 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8. The districts south of Twenty-third street still unprotected by high pressure service are:

District Number 2, bounded by Fourteenth street, Bowery, East Houston street and East River. The Commissioner states that this district is now provided with good fire protection through the installation of new 12 inch mains of the low pressure distribution system.

Districts Numbers 4 and 9, bounded by Chambers street, North River, Battery, East River, Maiden lane, Nassau street and Park row, an area of approximately 291 acres, plans for which are completed and in which construction will be begun shortly.

The Commissioner proposes gradually to extend the system to Districts Numbers 10, 11, 12 and 13, an area of approximately 1,707 acres, bounded by Twenty-third street, Madison avenue, East Twenty-fourth street, Lexington avenue, East Thirty-third street, Madison avenue, Fifty-ninth street and North River.

The present request for $1,000,000 is to provide for the extension of the service to District Number 10, lying between Twenty-third street and Thirty-fourth street, North River and Madison avenue, an area of approximately 436 acres.

It is the intention, as soon as the necessary appropriation is granted, to proceed actively with the preparation of plans and specifications for the installation of the high pressure service in District Number 10, so that the contracts will be advertised toward the end of 1912 and the bulk of the work done in 1913 and completed either at the end of that year or in the first part of 1914.

The Sailor's Hand in an Etching After Winslow Homer.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Some time ago I noticed in Knoedler's gallery an etching of Winslow Homer's "Life Line" which showed a hand of the sailor under the head of the woman he is rescuing. This does not show in the picture as it now is. Could it be possible that it was originally painted that way and altered after it was copied? If not, can you or any of your readers account for its being there in what purports to be a copy?

D. H. HYDE.

NEW YORK, February 24.

Fatal Thoughts Registered by the Bird of Ill Omen.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* What is the meaning of an old Irish saying implying that there was no possible hope of recovery from an illness the patient was afflicted with, "Its name is in the raven's book"?

J. M.

BROOKLYN, February 23.

Experto Crede.

She sued for a divorce, saying that her husband had gone to bed at the end of the summer and had remained there ever since.—*News Note.*

At the end of the summer he went to bed,
And he's remained there ever since, she said.
Well, taking this fact and that together,
He's a bit of an expert on the weather.

L. T. H.

A Lullaby.

The brown bird wings to its downy nest,
The gull skims home o'er the curling crest,
The sun sinks low in the western skies,
Hushaby baby, oh, shut your eyes.
You'll have to later to lots of things
Or find the world is a place of stings,
So better begin while some one sings
Hushaby baby, oh, shut your eyes.

The man in the moon both nods and blinks,
The stars are snatching their forty winks,
Dream winds are blowing from off the south;
Hushaby baby, oh, shut your mouth.
You'll have to later, if you are wise,
Or find the world is a place of sighs,
So better be taught by lullabies,
Hushaby baby, oh, shut your mouth.

MCLANDBURGH WILSON.

SECTIONAL FIGHT ON THE PANAMA CANAL BILL

Great Question Is Whether or Not It Shall Be a Free Waterway.

STRONG OPPOSITION TO IT

Middle West and Northwest Lined Up Against the Coast States.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 24.—A bill providing a permanent form of government for the Panama Canal zone and prescribing regulations for the conduct of the great waterway is being completed in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives.

This measure, which is of vital concern to the commercial interests of the United States, and which may to some extent affect our international relations, is certain to provoke one of the liveliest debates of the session. The big fight on this bill will be waged over the question of tolls.

Representatives from the middle West and Northwest insist that the future business stability of those sections is dependent upon the levying of tolls on traffic passing through the canal, whether such traffic is handled by American or foreign shippers. On the other hand representatives from the Atlantic and Pacific coasts declare that the object sought by the canal will not be attained unless the canal is made free to the commerce of the world. They add that in any event American ships should have the advantage of preferential rates as recommended by President Taft.

A canvass of the House committee discloses that a majority is unalterably opposed to the Panama Canal being made a free waterway. Most of the Republicans and all of the Democrats will fight the proposal that tolls be imposed on all ships, but that the charges be remitted to American owners. The Democrats argue that the suggestion of the President, if adopted, would mean the payment of subsidies. The Republican opponents of the plan, most of whom come from the central West, insist that a free canal or the remission of tolls to American shippers would reduce the volume of business in that region by 25 per cent.

The bill now in course of preparation in the House Committee on Foreign Commerce will provide that the canal and the Canal Zone shall be administered by the President through a Governor and such other officers as the President may appoint. This will give the President practically autocratic power on the Isthmus.

There is disagreement as to the Judicial system that shall obtain in the Canal Zone. Three courts now interpret the laws there. It is proposed that these tribunals shall be succeeded by one court on which general jurisdiction shall be conferred, including the right to try admiralty cases. At present trials are accorded in the Canal Zone only in capital cases. Democrats insist that trial by jury shall be extended to minor offences as in the United States proper. This is combatted by some of the Republican committee members. They point out that when the canal is opened for business all persons will be debarred from the Canal Zone except those having to do with its conduct and management. For this reason, it is argued, trial by jury would be prejudicial to discipline inasmuch as all those concerned will live under an administration akin to conditions that obtain in the military service.

The question as to the amount of tolls to be charged will be settled next week. At present a majority of the committee is disposed to adopt a provision levying a rate of about $1 a ton on the net register tonnage of vessels. This would amount to a charge of about forty to sixty cents a ton on cargo carriage, or from two to three cents a hundred pounds of freight carried. The decision to fix the tolls at $1 net registered ton is tentative. The rate may be slightly increased or reduced.

Under the terms of the proposed bill discretion is to be left to some extent with the President in the fixing of tolls. Minimum and maximum rates are to be prescribed as a limitation upon the authority of the Executive. There will be opposition in the House to this provision. An amendment will be offered when the bill comes up in the House limiting the jurisdiction of the President to questions of administration and conferring all authority as to canal rates upon the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The debate in the House on the canal bill is expected to be prolonged. The contest between the Pacific and Atlantic coast terminal interests on the one hand and the commercial interests of the central part is exceedingly bitter. Those who want a free canal or the alternative of preferential rates for American shipping declare that no substantial advantage will accrue to American commerce unless encouragement is given to coastwise traders through the medium of preferential rates. The opponents of this contention give four reasons why in their opinion it is untenable.

They say, first, that under treaty obligations the United States is bound to treat all shipping alike. Second, that the canal has proved so costly in its construction that commerce cannot in fairness expect to use the waterway without charge. It is further argued that freedom from a charge of two or three cents a hundred pounds on freight handled would be of no advantage to American shipping because, it is alleged, the foreign shipping combine exercises a monopoly of docking facilities on the two coasts. It is charged that as long as the foreign shipping combine controls such docking facilities coastwise traders would be debarred from whatever advantages might accrue from a free canal or the levying of preferential rates on American shipping. It is argued further that either a free canal or the remission of rates to American shippers would result disastrously to the business and commercial interests of the central West.

It is along the lines indicated that the fight over the Panama Canal bill is to be conducted. It will be a purely sectional contest devoid almost entirely of politics.

FREE TOUR FOR PROFESSORS.

Kahn Travelling Fellowship Foundation Asks Recommendations for Awards.

The board of trustees of the Kahn Travelling Fellowship Foundation has written a letter to the various colleges and universities in the United States, requesting recommendations for the awards which will be made on July 1.

The foundation is for the purpose of enabling professors in the more remote and the smaller colleges of the country to spend a year in foreign travel. Albert Kahn of Paris established the fund a year ago, and it is demonstrated by a board of trustees, composed of Charles W. Eliot, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler and Charles D. Walcote.

The Kahn Foundation is to further no special line of academic research. It is to enable men of proved intellectual attainments to enjoy during a year or more sufficient leisure to enter into contact with men and countries they might otherwise not have known.