WITH THE RAMBLER

In Odd Nooks And Crannies About The City

ON the terrace before houses Nos. 25, 23 and 21, at the southeast corner of 1st and A streets northeast, just where Maryland avenue enters 1st street, the inauguration committee on marking historic sites and buildings placed two of its familiar signs. One of these signs reads: "Site of the Old Capitol Building, Where President Monroe Was Inaugurated," and the other reads: "On This Site Was Capitol Prison, Where Many Famous Persons Were Confined During the Civil War." On the front of the northernmost of these houses is a bronze tablet, bearing this legend:

"Congress convened here during 1815-19 while the Capitol was being rebuilt, and here also the inauguration of President Monroe took place in 1817. Later the building became known as the brick Capitol, and was the home of many congressmen, including John C. Calhoun, who died within its walls March 31, 1850. During the civil war the building was used as a prison and called 'the Old Capitol Prison.'"

The land on which this building stands was a part of the farm of Daniel Carroll and soon after the city was laid out the land at the southeast corner of 1st and A streets was bought by Lund Washington, the first postmaster of Washington city. This owner soon after his purchase sold the land to George Walker. In 1804, it was bought by William Tunnecliffe, and he built there a hotel which appears in the early annals of the city as the Tunnecliffe Hotel. Tunnecliffe sold to Pontius D. Stelle, and the building then became celebrated as Stelle's Hotel. The number of hotels and taverns and boarding houses in early Washington was greater than the young city could support and Stelle's Hotel failed, being sold for debt and coming into possession of Peter Miller. An old account of this property recites that "the great house lost money for everybody who touched it, and at last, in 1812, it fell into the hands of the original owner of the land, Daniel Carroll. It continued to sink money for him, so he closed its doors, nailed up its shutters and left it to embrace decay. The audacious British saved the trouble of razing it, however, for after burning the Capitol, with its wealth of books and valuable old papers, they set their torches to the luckless old hotel and burned it to the ground."

* * *

With the capture of Washington by the British in 1814 and the destruction or at least the serious damaging of the two little sandstone wings of the Capitol—the only part of the great building that had then been erected—there arose a strong contention that the seat of government should be removed. Congress found a temporary refuge in Blodgett's Hotel, at the northeast corner of 8th and E streets northwest. This hotel had previously been used as a public building, the general post office and the patent office having been quartered in it some time before the war of 1812.

As a check to the propaganda for the removal of the seat of government, Elias B. Caldwell, W. Emack, Daniel Carroll, William Brent and Griffith Coombe organized a company called the Capitol Hotel Company, the purpose being to provide adequate temporary accommodation for Congress until the Capitol should be restored. Daniel Carroll's subscription to the stock of the company was in the form of land, and that at the southeast corner of 1st and A streets was chosen as the site for the new structure. The corner stone was laid July 4, 1815, and the building completed at a cost of $30,000. When the Fourteenth Congress met, December 11, 1815, in Blodgett's Hotel, or the patent office, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Henry Clay, directed attention to an offer of the Capitol Hotel Company to let to Congress the new building at a rental of $1,650 a year. In the chronicle from which the Rambler has abstracted much of the information here given occurs a description of the building, which says that "the building was a barn of a thing, its normal architecture remaining a gibe for years after Congress left it. The hall of the House was on the second floor. It was seventy-seven by forty-five feet, with a gallery, and the ceiling was twenty feet high. The Senate occupied the first floor hall, which was forty-five by twenty-five feet, with a fifteen-foot ceiling. The Supreme Court of the United States and the circuit Court of the District of Columbia also met there. The remainder of the big shell was given over to committee rooms."

As told by the bronze tablet and the temporary marker set there by the inauguration committee on historic sites, President Monroe was inaugurated there, the oath of office being administered to him while he stood on a little platform erected at the front entrance on 1st street. When Congress returned to the restored Capitol in 1819 the Capitol Hotel Company had an unprofitable building on its hands. It was put to various uses, one of these being a boys' school conducted by St. Patrick's Church, and another a dancing academy, but nothing seemed to prosper. About 1836 it was opened as a fashionable boarding house and many of the distinguished men in the national councils stayed there, and for a time the venture was successful. But more modern hotels supplanted it, and at the outbreak of the civil war the "Old Capitol" had become a tenement or cheap lodging house. In the spring and summer of 1861 a large number of people, Washingtonians and residents of the neighboring parts of the District of Columbia, suspected of secession sympathies or affiliations, or of giving aid and comfort to the enemy and of many forms of disloyalty to the Union, were taken into custody by the provost marshal. It finally became a problem as to where these prisoners could be detained, and the dilapidated building was converted to this use in July, 1861, and William P. Wood, who was especially widely known in Washington up to the time of his death a few years ago, was put in charge.

* * *

In addition to the old Capitol there were some houses extending south along 1st street, where the Congressional Library stands now—houses that had been used as a hospital for soldiers after the battle of Bladensburg, and which, after the man who bought them, came to be called the Duff Green row. These houses were also taken over by the government and were used as a jail, becoming part of the old Capitol prison. At one time there were upward of 1,400 prisoners confined in these buildings. A list of the persons held there would be a very long one and old Washingtonians would find many familiar names. Some members of the most prominent families of old Washington were at one time or another confined there. By the southern element in Washington the place was very commonly called "The Bastile."

The people in the eastern part of the District and those of Prince Georges county using the Navy Yard bridge were under pretty constant surveillance. Many of these had kindred and friends in the Confederate states' service, and there was an underground passage into the Confederate lines by way of Maryland point, Newport, Leonardtown and other places on the Maryland shore of the Potomac river. Quinine and brandy and other things sorely needed in the southern hospitals were constantly being smuggled out of Washington. Information of contemplated movements by the northern armies was also sent through by this route. Families living beyond the Eastern branch found difficulty in getting through the lines with medicines for their use and with whisky and brandy for their own juleps and toddies. A great many were arrested and detained in the Capitol prison for having been found with such things on them.

Belle Boyd, the Confederate spy, was one of the noted prisoners. Mrs. Rose Greenhow, an aunt of Mrs. Stephen A. Douglas, was among those detained there. The late Senator Vance was once a prisoner there, and so were Mrs. Jackson, mother of the Jackson who shot Ellsworth, and Barnes Compton, who became a representative in Congress from the fifth Maryland congressional district and whose final defeat by the late Sidney E. Mudd brought that politician into national prominence. Mrs. Mary Surratt was confined there immediately after her arrest and before her removal to the prison at the arsenal. Capt. Wirz, keeper of the Andersonville prison, was a prisoner in the Old Capitol, and his execution took place in the grounds at the rear of the building.

The present appearance of the row gives one no conception of the aspect of the place when all the history recorded here was making. The old Capitol was remodeled by J. F. D. Lanier of New York, who purchased the property soon after the close of the war. It was divided into fine dwellings, one of which was bought and occupied by Justice Field of the United States Supreme Court. The Duff Green row was razed when the site for the new building for the Library of Congress was being prepared.

* * *

Historic Gun at Navy Yard.

THERE is a prospect that the remains of Capt. Samuel Chester Reid may be removed from their present resting place and reinterred at Arlington. Capt. Reid died in Brooklyn about three months before the opening of the civil war, and it has been reported rests in an obscure grave in Greenwood cemetery in that city.

There has long been a monument in Washington to this gallant officer, though there is not the least doubt that Washingtonians generally overlook it or forget it. On the main drive or avenue of the Washington navy yard, the street which leads from the gateway at the foot of 8th street southeast down to the Eastern branch, past tree-lined lawns and busy offices and throbbing workshops, you will see an old black iron gun and carriage which have been standing there for many years. An inscription on the mount tells this story:

"This gun was one of the main battery of the French seventy-four-gun ship Hoche. She was captured by the English and her battery sold to America. This gun then served on a Haitian privateer, and afterward was returned to New York and lay in South street for several years. It was then mounted on the privateer Gen. Armstrong, and by its aid a boat attack from an English squadron the night of September 26-27, 1814, in Fayal, Azores, was repulsed, with a loss to the attacking force of 120 killed, 130 wounded and nearly all their boats destroyed. The American loss was two killed and eight wounded. The privateer was sunk to prevent its falling into the hands of the enemy, and this gun was many years afterward presented to the United States by the Portuguese government."

The greatest of the fighting privateers in the war of 1812 was the schooner General Armstrong of New York. She mounted eight long nine-pounders and one long forty-two-pounder on a pivot. She had many captures of British merchantmen to her credit, and off the Surinam river, South America, she sighted a supposed prize. Her captain then was Guy R. Champlin and she carried a crew of ninety men. What was mistaken for an English merchantman proved to be a British man-of-war of twenty-seven guns, but as the General Armstrong had sailed down close upon her before discovering the mistake, Champlin gave the order, "Close quarters and quick work." For more than an hour the General Armstrong engaged the Britisher at a distance of half a pistol shot. With her rigging riddled or shot away, and the captain wounded and a high percentage of the crew killed, the surviving men got out the sweeps and pulled away, the British ship being too much hurt to pursue.

* * *

Capt. Samuel Chester Reid succeeded Champlain, and September 26, 1814, the General Armstrong put into the port of Fayal. Soon afterward a British squadron—the Plantagenet of seventy-four guns, the Rota of thirty-eight and the Carnation of eighteen—entered that harbor. Early in the night four barges, each with forty men, put off from the British ships to "cut out" the American privateer. They were received with grape shot and retired. At midnight fourteen barges and five hundred men attacked the General Armstrong, but they were driven off with heavy loss. At daylight the Carnation took up a position and opened fire, but after a long duel the Englishman was so often hulled that he withdrew. Then the heavy Plantagenet came into position, and, further resistance being hopeless, Capt. Reid pointed the Long Tom down a hatch and sent two shots crashing through the bottom of the little craft. The torch was applied, and the General Armstrong and her ordnance went to the bottom of Fayal harbor.

That British squadron was bound for the Gulf of Mexico to co-operate against New Orleans. But the ships spent ten days at Fayal. In making repairs made necessary by the action with the General Armstrong, and thus Packenham's expedition was ten days later in receiving the aid carried by these ships than it would have been but for the General Armstrong.

Fayal was a neutral port, and there was long negotiation between the United States and Portugal over England's violation of neutrality. The General Armstrong's Long Tom was dug out of the harbor mud and then sent to the United States as a gift to this government. And this is the old gun which stands on the main avenue of the Washington navy yard.

* * *

Duck on Window Sill.

PERHAPS the family living in the house will be able to explain it, and perhaps not, but the Rambler did not care to pursue his inquiry further than to make the necessary observation and notation. If there are those who care to carry investigation to its final limit they are at liberty to do so in so far as the Rambler is concerned. Of course it will be necessary for the relentless investigator to treat with the people in the house.

On H street is an old house, and to be an old house in a city of such wonderful memories as Washington is to be also a historic house. However, the inaugural committee on the marking of historic sites and buildings has not put one of its handsome markers there, nor could the Rambler find a bronze tablet on the house, but there is no doubt in the mind of anybody who looks into the face of the old house that it is historic. It is in a historic neighborhood. Across H street—that is, on the south side—is the Decatur house, one of the most celebrated residences of the capital. Across Connecticut avenue—that is, on the east side—is the Daniel Webster-W. W. Corcoran house, and along in that square is the house in which Senator Slidell of Louisiana and Gideon Welles, Lincoln's Secretary of the Navy, lived, of course, at different times. And after passing that house you come to the fine home of the late John Hay.

* * *

This special house is four stories high. There is a basement with its windows looking out on the sidewalk. Then there is the parlor floor, the second floor and then the top floor. The house is three windows wide and the window panes are of the fashion of another day, not square, but much smaller than new houses now affect. At the middle of the front of the house is a covered porch, the top supported by two brown fluted pillars. Above the top of this porch is the middle window of the three in the second floor. On the sill of that window with the head and bill pointing east is the image of the subject of this story. It is a duck, or drake. It may be a wild duck. It may be a puddle duck. Its color is dark. Viewed from the street one cannot be certain whether it is carved of stone or wood or cast in bronze. It is so natural in appearance that it may be a stuffed duck. It appears to be a stuffed duck. Those persons who see it for the first time believe it to be a family pet perched outside the window, but they see it again and again and it never moves.

What is the reason a duck is perched on the windowsill of this old house? What is the story that lies behind? A man can make a thousand guesses at it, but they would be only guesses.

* * *

Pan-American Lamps.

THERE are no lamps in Washington like those that shed their soft glow at the east entrance to the Pan-American building on 17th street. Very many persons overlook them because they are only a single feature of that dazzling white building and are encompassed by so many other beautiful things.

From the sidewalk is a level space of pure white marble pave leading to a low flight of seven marble steps. At the sides of this wide and low stairway are the lamps, which are of gray green bronze, resting on square marble pedestals taller than the tallest man. Then the eye sees the base of the lamps, a lion's paw with prominent claws supporting each corner. Above this base is the strong circular stem of the lamp, and next above is the lamp proper, modeled after the fashion of a great lantern. The light is glass-inclosed, three panes high of frosted glass and twelve panes in circumference. Thus there are thirty-six of these panes of glass, each about the size of the old-fashioned window lights familiar in old-time houses and which are sometimes put in new houses for colonial or early republican effect. Around the base of each light are six small bronze heads of tigers. The top of each lamp is convex and reminds one of the top of a big, round tureen or chafing dish.

* * *

Flanking the lamps are a marble balustrade and the sunken garden, with its rich green turf bordered by white marble coping and hedges of box. In the garden at each side of the approach are yellow graveled walks coped with white marble and with short staircases which overcome the difference in level between that of the street and the lower garden. Also notable are four big old sycamore trees—three in the north garden and one in the south.

In the southeast corner of the south garden is a sign, put there by the inaugural committee on the marking of historic sites, which reads:

"Site of the residence of Gen. Van Ness, who married the daughter of Davy Burns, original owner of the grounds now occupied by the White House, Treasury and the State, War and Navy departments."

The sign stands close to a great old sycamore, the noon shadow of which falls across the marker. Perhaps the shade of that sycamore fell often on Gen. Van Ness and his wife, Marta Burns, and perhaps it was growing there when old Davy owned the land.

WHEN RAILROADS HELD WASHINGTON'S PARKS AND STREETS

THE site of the old Pennsylvania railroad station, on which it is proposed to erect the George Washington memorial, suggests a long line of remarkable memories. It recalls a period of railroad usurpation of public property and ruthless disregard of people's rights, and it also recalls the greatest campaign against corporation arrogance and official wrongdoing ever waged in defense of a city and its people by a newspaper. That newspaper was The Evening Star. The strangle hold of the railroads on the streets, avenues and government reservations of the American Capital, and the desperate and prolonged contest by which this iron grip was broken, is a story that touches every home and every interest in the District of Columbia. The man who looks upon the grand Union station sees trains rushing along steel and stone viaducts and hears them rumbling through tunnels, should think back to the time when locomotive smoke floated over Pennsylvania avenue, when freight and passenger trains thundered through the streets, crossing other streets at grade, disrupting city traffic and killing and maiming victims by the hundred, and when magnificent avenues and government reservations, without right, were used as freight and switching yards.

It is a great change that has come about and the moving spirit of that change was The Star. It was the men behind The Star who had the imagination to see that the parks and streets should be freed from and preserved from railroad control, and that Washington, to fulfill its destiny as the world's greatest capital, must end the railroad rule and blight which had been fastened on it in its youth, and which grew more domineering and rapacious as Congress smiled approval and the years passed.

* * *

The railroad evils under which Washington suffered were cumulative and progressive. The railroads' appetite grew by what it fed on and the patience of the people, long strained, was approaching the breaking point. For the most part the people whose rights were directly invaded were small property holders—home owners and plain citizens. The railroads' power seemed impregnable at the Capitol, and their influence insinuated itself in other directions. The nation-wide agitation against corporate corruption, stimulated by railroads' insolence due to their feeling of security, while brewing had not broken out. However, they were to be curbed in the District of Columbia.

The chief instrument in the correction of the railroad evils was The Star. The paper had influence because for nearly half a century it had been identified with the people of the District and had always championed the cause of good government against local ring rule and congressional neglect. It had always contended for a National Capital worthy of the nation. Everybody in Washington had not always agreed with it, but even those who did not admitted their belief in its sincerity and honor. The paper had "character." It went into every home and was read. It talked to the people in everyday English (and good English), and was more concerned about accuracy of statement than style, and more interested in presenting sound doctrine than in making phrases. These were some of the reasons why The Star had influence not only with the citizens of the District of Columbia but with the national legislature, or with that part of it bent on giving the District a square deal. They understood that The Star represented the intelligent opinion of the city. It tirelessly presented the ideals and the rights and wrongs of Washington. With the news and editorial departments working together, local public sentiment was fused and organized, whereas formerly it had been intermittent.

Every civic body was heartened and public opinion began to weigh heavier and heavier against railroad tyranny. A sentiment was developed in Congress that the national city should be redeemed. Every civic agency was fighting under the inspiration of The Star, and day after day and year after year the pounding by The Star brought congressional opinion to a point where railroad management became inclined to deal with the question on its merits. The grade crossings were abolished and other railroad abuses were corrected.

Day after day through the years from 1886 until the acceptance of defeat and change of front by the railroads and their representatives in Congress, The Evening Star hammered away at railroad occupation of streets and parks, railroad obstruction of cross streets, railroad at grade in the city limits, railroad speed excesses in the city, death and injury at grade crossings, railroad continuance of the Long bridge, railroad lawlessness, railroad avarice and railroad influence in Congress.

* * *

The position of the railroads was attacked at every point and from every angle. Relentlessly and pitilessly the fight was waged until the railroads yielded. The result of that victory has been a benefit to Washington not calculable in sums of money. The campaign which The Evening Star set in motion and kept in motion drew into the contest a large number of broad and able men who devoted a share of their talents toward compelling just treatment for Washington. Among this distinguished number should be mentioned Senator Justin D. Morrill of Vermont and Senator James McMillan of Michigan, and, finally, A. J. Cassatt, president of the Pennsylvania railroad, in succession to Scott and Roberts, and the greatest, most progressive and broadest minded of American railroad men.

The year 1870 found Washington distraught with ward politics, municipal scandals and bankruptcy and with only such railroad facilities north, east and west as the Baltimore and Ohio monopoly, arrogant and obtuse, was willing to concede. Washington hoped for adequate facilities, and some of the persistent optimists in Washington dreamed and talked of a greater Washington.

The act of Congress approved February 5, 1867, gave the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company authority to construct its line into Washington and to locate a passenger depot on Virginia avenue. In The Star of February 2, 1870, it may be read that pending in Congress was a bill extending the time of the completion of the road from 1871 to 1875, and providing also for a change of its route and terminus in Washington, authorizing it to lay tracks on 6th street and to locate its passenger depot at 6th and B streets. Senator Morrill was prompt in opposing the dedication of this public land between the Capitol and the White House to railroad uses. Senator Cameron thought the need of another railroad was so great that the wishes of the railroad company should be met. However, action on the bill was delayed, and The Star of February 3, 1870, said:

> We are heartily in favor of granting every possible facility to new railroads to this city, but it seems to us to be going too far to allow any company to bring their cars to the very heart of the city and through the line of public grounds. It is perhaps a necessary evil that the railroad track (above the level of the street) and the platform and buildings appertaining to the railroad shall disfigure Maryland avenue, and the nuisance of the present track of the Baltimore and Ohio to the foot of the Capitol is one from which the city is suffering greatly, but to permit the Baltimore and Potomac road to penetrate to Pennsylvania avenue, the very business center of the city, would be an intensification of all the evils that have been experienced from railroads on and across our streets. We think Mr. Morrill's objections yesterday very timely, and hope that they will have due weight when action is taken on the bill.

* * *

To apprehend the foresight revealed by this little editorial one should recall that the Baltimore and Potomac was coming as the deliverer of Washington from the thraldom of the Baltimore and Ohio; that the site desired by the new railroad for its station was then common; that the probability of park development was remote; that the mass of the people had no such conception of the uses of parks as people have today, and that what the Baltimore and Potomac railroad was soliciting was a trifle in comparison with what it afterward grabbed without color of warrant.

At that time the subject of railroads was an engrossing one in Washington. The people of the District were approaching financial ruin, first because they were trying with their meager resources to run a capital for the nation, a city that had been created by government authority with the understanding that the national government should foster and develop it, and second, because of the conflict between local factional forces Washington was suffering under the same political misfortunes which have afflicted many so-called self-governing municipalities. Washington was created by federal authority without reference to its adaptability or availability of location for trade and commerce, and in the early 70's the people of Washington, face to face with ruin and with the advertising columns of the newspapers burdened with foreclosure notices, were trying to save themselves and their city by increasing the volume of business. The prospect of increased railroad facilities gave them hope.

The bill for track extension and change of station site led to a bitter contest between the representatives of the Baltimore and Ohio interests and the representatives of the new line. John W. Garrett of the Baltimore and Ohio, to offset the measure to give the new road a much more favorable depot site than the Baltimore and Ohio, had promoted a proposition to establish a union station at the intersection of Maryland and Virginia avenues between 7th and 9th streets, Garrett's plan being that the Baltimore and Ohio should reach that station by means of a tunnel under Capitol Hill.

The Pennsylvania officials and their congressional agents insisted on the 6th street site and exclusive use of the station to be erected there. Hearings were held on the bill by the House District committee, and public-spirited Washingtonians opposed the bisection of the Mall by railroad tracks, but March 22, 1872, the District committee, through Mr. Starkweather, favorably reported the bill granting the 6th and B streets site to the Baltimore and Potomac railroad. It was entitled "A bill to confirm the action of the board of aldermen and common council of the city of Washington designating a depot site for the Baltimore and Potomac railroad, and for other purposes," and providing also "that the United States shall have the right to repeal or modify the provisions of this act." The Baltimore and Ohio congressmen filibustered against the bill for a number of days, but it was passed.

The bill came before the Senate April 9, 1872, and Mr. Cameron moved that its consideration be proceeded with. Mr. Morrill spoke against the propriety of giving so considerable portion of land to a railroad company without any equivalent. He disliked to go against his friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. Cameron, but he considered it his duty to stand up for the rights of the United States. He hoped that Senator Cameron, who, as Secretary of War, had done so much to save the capital from the rebels, would not now surrender such a fair portion into the hands of a grasping corporation. "Can it," he asked, "be possible that any one of us will be willing to mar the beauty of this Capitol by such desecration of the public grounds which surround it? In fact, in view of the terms by which the United States acquired title to these grounds proposed to be given away, I doubt whether Congress has the power to confirm the grant made by the territorial legislature." He favored allowance of all proper railroad facilities, but thought this bill should be referred to the committee on public buildings and grounds instead of to that on the District of Columbia.

* * *

There was a contest over the reference of the bill. Senator Hamilton of Maryland pointed out the effect on surrounding property wherever railroad depots were located, that they were surrounded by tenement houses and groggeries and that the streets were blocked up with vehicles of all kinds. He deprecated the idea of giving up to this desecration the great Avenue of Washington, and the marring of the symmetry of the public grounds.

He believed that it was the duty of Congress to exercise the most watchful supervision over the city, to improve and beautify it, as it was to be the capital of the country not for fifty years or a hundred years, but for all time. But on the motion to refer to the committee on public buildings and grounds the vote was 18 for and 39 against, and it was accordingly referred to the committee on the District of Columbia.

Public opinion in Washington was excited over the idea of giving up a parcel of the Mall, a piece of land which would interfere with the proposed development of the park. In the old chronicles may be found accounts of citizens' indignation meetings. The bill was favorably reported back to the Senate May 15, 1872. Messrs. Morrill and Sumner were strongly in opposition to it. Mr. Morrill offered an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert a provision that the chief of engineers of the United States Army, the engineer officer in charge of public buildings and grounds and the quartermaster general of the United States Army be named as a commission to report on the laying of steam railroad tracks in the city of Washington and on the location and construction of depots as bearing on the obstruction of streets and avenues or public parks.

Senator Sumner said he could not consent to destroy a park, and could not imagine how any one could consent to it.

Senator Stockton said he was a practical man, and that the park ought not to be where it was. It ought to be in the country.

The following is taken from The Star of May 16, 1872:

> Senate.—The Baltimore and Potomac railroad depot site bill was taken up, and a large number of amendments were offered by Messrs. Morrill of Vermont, Hamilton of Maryland and Davis of West Virginia, all of which were voted down and the bill passed as it came from the House—ayes, 39; nays, 16.

Mr. Morrill of Vermont then offered an order that the chair appoint a committee of two to wait on the vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company (Col. Thomas Scott) and ask him if he has any further communication to make to the Senate.

Mr. Conkling suggested that Mr. Morrill have permission to wait on Mr. Scott.

The decade from 1874 to 1884 was a period of increasing railroad presumption and rapacity. The citizens suffered loss of life and injury to property while the railroads blocked the proper esthetic development of the capital. Citizens raged, but were impotent against the railroad-Congress coalition. There was feeble and unorganized opposition on the part of many citizens in 1880 against railroad usurpation and more and more railroad encroachments that were threatened. January 6 of that year The Star, which had consistently opposed the street and park grab policy of the roads, published an editorial on the dangers of the grade crossings which attracted wide attention. Publicity and encouragement were given to the South Washington people then engaged in a fight against a bill which provided that the Baltimore and Ohio might reach South Washington and parallel the Pennsylvania tracks by building through streets in East Washington. Hearings on this bill were held by committees of Congress. August 6, 1886, Senator Ingalls delivered a great speech on the subject of the outrageous treatment of the people of the District of Columbia by the Baltimore and Potomac railroad. It was masterful rhetoric, and the people of Washington regretted that as the fight against the railroads progressed Senator Ingalls' ardor in behalf of the rights of Washington cooled.

During the winter of 1886-87 the enemies of the railroads were skirmishing. At the beginning of 1887 The Star went to the front and boomed with editorials that encouraged all those who had hitherto been too faint-hearted or too prudent to resist so powerful an enemy as the steam railroads. The Star opened an aggressive fight along the whole line of the railroads' position.

* * *

The railroads increased their activity in marshaling their friends and in distributing passes. Men not to be influenced by mere cash were swayed in their opinion by free transportation. The evils of the railroad pass were illustrated in Washington as clearly as ever in the history of that insidious instrument. The Star was filled with news of railroad aggression and stories of the wrongs of the people. Train conductors were now and then being arrested for blocking cross streets. Locomotive engineers were now and then being taken into court for exceeding the speed limit within the city. Every grade crossing accident, and unhappily they were numerous, was being featured in the news pages of The Star and made the text of editorials.

Senator Ingalls introduced a bill January 24, 1887, to define the routes of steam railroads in the city. The provisions of the bill probably marked an advance over the conditions then existing, but it was not satisfactory. January 25 The Star printed this editorial:

> The bill introduced in the Senate yesterday to define the routes of steam railroads in the District, provides for a union depot upon Armory square. The benefits and safeguards proposed by the bill do not compensate for this gift of a public reservation if the interests of Washington are to be considered. The plan of public grounds extending from the Capitol to the river south of the White House should not be broken up for railroad purposes. The reservations, the breathing places of the city, should not be clogged and obstructed for any other purpose. If Washington were a little prairie town, living by virtue of its railroad connections or hoping to live by securing a railroad connection, a bonus of this kind would not be extraordinary, but if the railroads here wish to retain depot grounds in the heart of the city, let them condemn and pay for property like other roads in other cities—Philadelphia, for instance. It is hardly possible that in order to obtain the boon of a union depot and relief from some of the evils of the present railroad practices the beauty and harmony of the city parking must be permanently disfigured and the health spots of the city given over to the corporations.
>
> The proposed legislation proceeds upon the theory that Congress is never content unless it is giving away the public grounds to some railroad or other corporation or in dumping some architectural monstrosity upon them like the new pension office. At the present rate of progress, in ten years there will not be a rod square of ground in all the government reservations that is not occupied by a railroad depot with all its dirty surroundings, or any altitudinous atrocity like the new pension office, or squatty, toad-shaped, zebra-striped atrocity like the National Museum, or an attitudinizing brass horse standing on three legs, or two legs, or possibly on one leg.
>
> The railroads can hardly be blamed for proposing to appropriate Armory Square without paying for it. From their point of view there is a modesty and diffidence about the request which seems to suggest that they have taken to heart the recent senatorial denunciation of their doings in the District and are slightly nervous and bashful. Why, bless your innocent souls, Messrs. Corporations, the senators did not mean anything! Indignant words are only vents of energy which might otherwise result in action. Next time ask for everything for the best in sight and slightly you think you can get. There is a nice level space directly east of the Capitol building which is public ground and will therefore cost you nothing and is admirably adapted for depot purposes. From that site the work of side-tracking both houses of Congress can proceed with greater facility. And The Star ventures to suggest, with the diffidence of a non-professional, that the rotunda of the Capitol would make a capital roundhouse.

The idea that the railroads might use the east plaza of the Capitol for a depot and the rotunda for a roundhouse was one that lived in local memory. Even today when anybody begins to talk of railroad influence the phrase "Make a roundhouse of the rotunda" comes trippingly from the tongue.

This outline sketch of the railroad occupation of Washington has brought us through the first period of the early 70's, and into the thick of the fighting in the 80's, and the narrative of the remainder of this great newspaper campaign must be reserved for a second chapter.

(Continued next Sunday.)

SLOW STARVATION MAY BE THE LOT OF THE KAISER'S EVER-INCREASING ARMY

GERMANY'S Hungry Legions Are the Worst Fed and the Worst Housed in Europe—Costs Less Per Head to Run the German Army Than It Does to Run the French, Austrian or Italian, Largely Because of the Inadequate Allowance for Food to the Defenders of the Fatherland—During the Last Thirty Years, in Which the Price of Everything Has Doubled, the Meager Wages of the German Warriors Have Remained Practically Unchanged—Full Infantry Private Draws Only $1.50 a Month, Which Is Sufficient to Pay for Only Half of His Private Laundry Bill—Living on 8 Cents a Day.

Special Correspondence of The Star.

BERLIN, April 3, 1913.

GERMANY is increasing its army at a mad pace; $250,000,000 above the usual amount spent annually on the kaiser's mailed fist are about to be raised to make it the most perfect instrument of war in the history of the world; infantry, artillery, cavalry, communications, aeronautics, railways—everything, in fact, will be improved out of all recognition, except the stomachs of the soldiers. Seven times within the past thirteen years has the reichstag passed resolutions asking that something be done for the payment and feeding of the nation's defenders. But the imperial government has always pleaded the same excuse—lack of money. The problem of the "hungry legions" is worse today than ever.

During the thirty years in which everything else in Europe has doubled in price the wages of the German warrior have remained practically unchanged. The bill of two years ago attempted to remedy this grievance, but did not go far. So Germany's soldiers remain worse paid than any others, with perhaps the exception of Russia's.

* * *

The full infantry private in a line regiment gets only $1.50 a month; the sergeant gets $8, and the highest paid man in the non-commissioned ranks gets only $7. This is the sergeant-major, or 'feldwebel.'" The privileged services and a few privileged guards regiments are a little better off. The guards infantry is rich on $2; the guards cavalry man on $2.50, but the foot, or fortress, artilleryman and the field artilleryman get only the minmum, $1.50. Men on the railways get $2. The highest wage in the ranks is $15.50 a month, and that can be reached only after serving at least six years. When the state is in a particularly generous mood it gives "rewards." The "reward" for being the best shot in a guard chasseur regiment is 62 cents a month.

Every ten days the German private soldier gets his wage of 50 cents. On this money he has partly to feed and clothe himself, as the thrifty state does not provide what is necessary for health. He has to pay for his washing bill, for haircutting and shaving, for soap and for sewing materials. The state provides for the washing of his bedclothes, but all washing of his own clothing he must provide out of his monthly $1.50. It is estimated that on these necessary things a soldier spends at least $3 a month, so that his wage of $1.50 pays only for half. And nothing is left for amusement.

The state compels the young German to serve, but does not even provide his preliminary outfit. When he is appointed to a regiment he has to produce a whole stock of relatively expensive things which ought to be part of his outfit and which he cannot do without. He has to bring warm jackets to wear under his uniform in cold weather, five brushes of different kinds, leather cloths for cleaning his rifle, cleaning powders and socks. The least he can buy these things for is $5. This is equal to three months' wages. As a rule the young workingman of seventeen or eighteen has to save money in order to be able to enter the army respectably. If not, his parents have to supply him. Often the money is borrowed, and thousands of soldiers enter the army in debt to money-lenders, who demand usurious interest. The young soldier is in trouble during all his two years' service.

The state shows a particular and ingenious meanness in the way it deals with the soldiers' canteens. The rich officers are given free use of state buildings for their clubs and casinos, and the hungry soldeirs have to pay the state a rent for the use of government buildings as canteens. The state lays a niggard hand on the surpluses of the canteens, which are entirely derived from the men's money. It compels the canteens to buy large stocks of tedious political and religious journals, which the men do not read. When—in a rare generous mood—it resolves to give a reward to a man for good shooting or for otherwise serving with distinction, it does not always do this out of its own pocket. It takes the money out of the profits of the canteen, which ought to go for the benefit of the soldiers.

* * *

Many essentials of military equipment are supplied in this way at the men's expense. The government does not even supply the army with water buckets, which are indispensable. It lets the regiments buy the buckets out of the profits of the canteen.

Germany's soldiers, thanks to the state's incredible thrift, are the worst clothed in Europe. Both boots and overcoats are cheap and bad. For parade purposes the soldiers have good and new uniforms, but for ordinary drill and daily life they wear patched and ancient garments. The reason of this is the queer system of allotting money.

Once a year every army corps is credited with a fixed sum for uniforms, which it is told it must not exceed. It is instructed at the same time to save as much of this money as possible. Thus every regiment understands that Berlin requires it to be as cheaply and as badly clothed as possible. The "one-year" soldiers have to pay for all their clothes. The ordinary private's uniform suit goes through miscellaneous adventures lasting on an average for nine years before it is finally cast away. Sometimes it lies for years in the magazine of a landwehr battalion before being first worn. Then for years it is worn only on parade and special occasions, for the temporary owner on ordinary occasions wears old and patched uniforms. The uniform passes from soldier to soldier, and as it loses its newness is worn more and more for ordinary everyday use. When it has got to its sixth owner it is worn every day, and when reduced to a rag, more patches than original, it is still handed on to some unlucky conscript for wearing in times of rough work.

* * *

The German infantry equipment has been repeatedly condemned. The articles composing it are too light, and many of them fall to pieces. This is a result of state thrift. The infantry boot in particular was condemned. Similar boots were worn by the Russians in the far east, and was one of many causes of their defeat by the Japanese. Whether worn with socks, or as Germans mostly wear it, with "fusslappen" wound round the foot, it causes soreness. The superior marching of French infantry is ascribed to their wearing a smaller and lighter boot.

German's warriors are probably the worst fed in Europe. Certainly they are the cheapest fed, although food in Germany is dearer than anywhere else. Thirty pfennigs a day, or about 8 cents, is allowed for morning, midday and evening meals. Until three years ago the amount allowed was only 6 cents. The morning meal is merely coffee, costing less than a cent; the evening meal coffee and a fragment of sausage. The midday dinner is the only real meal supplied, and it is prepared by the men themselves, with the result of waste. The corporals and other non-commissioned officers are little better off than the privates. The corporal's board costs 1 cent a day extra, and the sergeant major's costs 3 cents extra. The 8 cents a day is for board on what is known as "lower scale." This is allowed when the men are in garrison. When they are on active service during maneuvers they are put on "higher scale," and get 4½ cents extra. For the lower scale allowance the soldier gets about one and one-half pounds of bread, a little coffee, five ounces of raw meat, including 10 per cent of bone; half a pound of vegetables, and some salt.

* * *

The "higher scale" allowance contains about two ounces more meat. Whatever more the German soldier eats, whether of necessaries or luxuries, comes out of his own pocket or the pockets of relatives or adoring cooks.

Germany's feeding system dates back to the eighteenth century—to the glorious days of Frederick the Great, when Prussia was a poor state and when the standard of living was very much lower than it is today. It is estimated that since then Germany has multiplied her wealth more than twentyfold. But she persists in feeding her soldiers practically in the same way as she did a hundred and fifty years ago. The food is rough in quality and insufficient in quantity. At an age when they have not ceased growing, young Germans are thus taken from relatively prosperous working class and peasant families and kept for two years in a state of underfeeding. And with this go underhousing and inferior clothing

Although the army has increased by 50,000 men in the last ten years, the barrack accommodation remains unchanged, and many men are put up in temporary iron shelters. The barracks are always underheated, and, as in summer time no oil is allowed for lighting, men have to go to bed in the dark.

That is the way in which thrifty Germany treats her defenders. No wonder her army costs less per head than the French, Austrian and Italian armies. The weak side of the system is its reaction on the men. The discipline is far too good to allow of hunger revolts, but the men show their discontent by obstinately refusing to serve as non-commissioned officers after their two years' term has expired. Under the two years' service law, all non-commissioned officers are got by inducing men to stay on, but no compulsion can be used.

The inducement given is a promise of a post in the police and on the railroads after retirement to civilian life. These posts are much coveted. But such is the dislike of remaining in the army that the best men usually refuse; second-best men must be taken for training as non-coms, and this operates injuriously upon the discipline and morals of the whole army.

The new army bill, as far as is known, will not do anything to remedy these evils. A few military journals are clamoring that something be done at least toward improving the infantry private's food. But the usual objection will be made that the state has no money, and Germany's hungry legions will remain as hungry as ever.

(Copyright, 1913, by Curtis Brown.)

ANECDOTES CONCERNING WELL KNOWN PEOPLE

The Poor Pedestrian.

SECRETARY OF WAR GARRISON is, of course, no foe to the automobile, but during his judgeship in New Jersey he always showed a commendable respect for the rights of the foot passenger.

Mr. Garrison, commenting on an accident where an automobilist had been selfish and reckless, once said:

"This man's attitude toward the general public reminds me of Spede, whom a friend asked