The Times-Dispatch

DAILY—WEEKLY—SUNDAY.

Business Office.....916 E. Main Street
Manchester Bureau.....1103 Hull Street
Petersburg Bureau.....109 N. Sycamore Street
Lynchburg Bureau.....215 Eighth Street

BY MAIL. POSTAGE PAID	One Year.	Six Mos.	Three Mos.	One Mo
Daily with Sunday	$6.00	$3.00	$1.50	.55
Daily without Sunday .	4.00	2.00	1.00	.35
Sunday edition only ...	2.00	1.00	.50	.25
Weekly (Wednesday) ..	1.00	.50	.25	...

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs), Manchester and Petersburg—

	One Week
Daily with Sunday.....	14 cents
Daily without Sunday.....	10 cents
Sunday only	5 cents

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1910.

RENEW THE APPROPRIATION FOR ROADS.

The Times-Dispatch is sorry to hear of lukewarmness among our legislators toward the State road fund and an apparently growing inclination on the Hill to scale down the appropriation this year or omit it altogether. A tight rein on our expenditures is doubtless necessary at present, but this seems a particularly bad place to pull in the lines. Road-building is just about the biggest work that Virginia is now doing. In importance to the life and growth of the State it entirely eclipses all the purely political, governmental and economical questions that will come before the Legislature. It is the foundation-stone upon which all our plans for material progress very largely rest.

Governor Swanson's administration has, with good reason, been praised on all sides as notably progressive and constructive. No work done during his term is comparable to what has been done for the roads and schools of the State, and this is what his administration will be longest remembered for. Roads and schools more closely and vitally affect the daily lives of more people than any other agencies or institutions under the supervision of government. Whether they are good or bad makes a vast difference to nearly every man, woman and child of us. The two things are very closely bound together. A good school loses much of its value if the roads leading to it are so bad for three months in the year that half the pupils cannot travel them. Whatever hits the roads hits the schools, and these are exactly the two places where we cannot afford now to put in any damaging licks.

State aid to roads has by no means done its work, as we hear it argued sometimes. It was not designed simply as a "demonstration" to get a good roads movement started with a single appropriation and thereafter to drop it under the optimistic impression that it would run along under its own momentum. It was impossible that the movement could get enough headway in so short a time to do this, and it will not do it.

That State aid has been a tremendous driving power is shown by the fact that all but about ten counties have either used their allotment, or put in a claim for it to be used later on, and by the unprecedent results in roads actually built or arranged for, during the last two years. To withdraw this aid now would be to give the whole movement, the most valuable in Virginia's present program of material advance, a severe blow. It would be deliberately clapping the brakes on the wheels of progress, which are spinning none too fast now. Nothing of the sort should be contemplated. If we must economize, let us do it elsewhere. Governor Swanson, following Governor-elect Mann, suggests that certain definite revenues of the State be segregated for road-building. This is as desirable and satisfactory a way as any other. The main thing, however, is to provide the money, and the Legislature should not hesitate a moment. We have put our hands to the plow with fine results, and this is no time to be thinking about turning back.

EXPLOITING CONSUMPTIVES.

Some months ago The Times-Dispatch received from a woman reader in a nearby county a typewritten copy of a statement, written by somebody else, in praise of Quito as a resort for consumptives. We were asked to publish this statement and cheerfully did so, hoping that it might bring a message of hope to some poor sufferer. A little later another reader wrote to us, attracted by the statement and seeking further information.

Now we find a letter in the New York Sun, dated Quito, December 17, and signed with the name of Jacob Greenbaum. Mr. Greenbaum states that his attention was caught by an advertisement in a New York newspaper lauding Quito as "a paradise for consumptives" where they would be cured without medicines," and by an article in a popular magazine appearing about the same time and to the same effect.

He asks the Sun to publish his letter in order to "keep a lot of sick people out of trouble." Part of his statement follows:

I was one of the dupes, but not the only one. People afflicted with the disease ought not to come here. The climate of Quito is not what was described in the advertisement or in the magazine article. Moreover, if you wish to live in Quito decently it is one of the most expensive cities in the world. The people who are back of this "fake" ought to be ashamed of themselves to dupe sick people. I would gladly return to the United States if I had the means.

If Mr. Greenbaum's statement is correct, it is hard to escape the impression that somebody interested in building up Quito is conducting an organized propaganda to carry American consumptives thousands of miles from their homes on a hopeless quest for health. If this is so, the meanest man in the world seems to have been discovered at last. He who for the sake of gain deliberately deceives and entraps invalids through their hopes is without competitors in meanness. Compared to him, we can discern only an amiable weakness in that other man, also working in the tuberculosis field and discovered in the Christmas season, who sucks the Red Cross stamps from the letters he receives and uses them to glorify his own correspondence.

THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE.

A new American institution passes into history to-day. When the last speech is made in the Governors' Conference in Washington and the last suggestion for uniform State legislation has been heard, historians will be ready to note that the Governors of the American States, for the first time in their history, have met by their own resolution, to discuss problems that concern the welfare of all the States as States.

The necessity for legislation and the necessity for uniform legislation both justify the conference. Every one knows that while we have too many laws upon some subjects, we have too few upon others; while we cover certain fields of government with the fine-tooth comb of statutes, we leave tangled and unkempt many subjects that vitally concern the welfare of the people. In that twilight zone of power that separates the realm of the Federal government from the realms of the States various evils flourish unchecked, various abuses prosper. By mapping out State legislation against these the Conference of Governors can surely help to strengthen the backbone of the government, can check many of the evils and stamp out many of the abuses.

But not less important is the necessity for uniform State legislation upon important points—legislation that will give the average man a fair idea of his rights in certain directions in any State—legislation that will simplify the control of corporations and facilitate their proper operations. Pure foods, sales and shipment, public health, insurance, marriage and divorce, wills and probates, are but a few of the many subjects upon which uniform laws are imperatively desired. Of course, a conference of Governors cannot enact these laws, but it can give the executives themselves definite ideas as to what the laws should be, and will certainly aid them in influencing their Legislatures to secure them.

But while uniform legislation is desired along these and kindred lines, it is neither desired nor expected along others. The average American State has its own problems and its own conditions which no general laws will suit. The State will therefore always expect to decide these problems and meet these conditions in the manner that seems best to it. By suggesting laws upon these matters, the Governors might defeat their own plans by arousing widespread opposition. But they are not likely to do anything of the sort, and by keeping within their proper province, as they certainly may be expected to do, they can build helpfully for the future.

EPICURES AND OYSTERS.

There is never any accounting for tastes, as the famous old lady remarked as she gave her chaste salute to the bovine. Very wisely and happily has Providence ordained that some of us shall like one thing and some another, thus assuring variety to life and faithful admirers to pretty nearly everything and everybody in the world. If all the men loved Mary and her only, then would there be no marrying or giving in marriage, and the human race would quickly perish from the earth. But it is wisely ordained that Sophy and Sue and Sally shall also find true lovers, and the lass that Brown privately and rudely dismisses as impossible immediately draws Smithkins as the one girl in the world, etc.

As with lasses, so with oysters. We have not the slightest quarrel with General John Gill, of Baltimore, because he boldly announces that he likes Cape Cod oysters better than Virginia Lynn Havens or Mobjacks or Horn Harbors. It's entirely all right, Providence has put into the world oysters of every race, denomination, style, shape and hue, to appeal to all tastes from the most cultivated to the most primeval. Somebody had to love Cape Cod oysters and it might as well be Gill. The General is clearly within his rights as a citizen of a free country, and there is no complaint at this point. But what we do object to most emphatically is his being put forward in the same breath as "a famous epicure" and connoisseur. Every school-child in these parts can see that the thing is a clear contradiction in terms. A famous epicure who prefers Cape Cod oysters to the transcendent bivalves of Virginia's world-renowned waters! As well speak of the "distinguished art authority" who prefers the colored supplement to Rembrandt and Turner, the "great horse expert" who exalts the humble donkey above the finest equine strains of blue-grass Virginia and Kentucky, the "celebrated literary critic" who hotly champions Miss Libbey and disparages Wm. Shakespeare. In brief, to admit a preference for Cape Cod oysters is immediately to forfeit every claim to standing in all the recognized epicure-circuits of the world.

We are no local oystermen's gazette and we refrain from deriding the well-meaning products of Massachusetts Bay. We sincerely believe that they are doing the best they can and are not entitled to be shot. Of the Virginia oysters we shall only remark at this time that it is the fine flower of oysterdom, the supreme expression of shellfishness, the queen of the bivalve world, the last word in molluscs. Our private statistics show conclusively that real connoisseurs who have once tried this peerless oyster have thenceforward rejected all others with contumely and contempt.

REPUBLICAN TRESPASSERS IN DEMOCRATIC PRIMARIES.

No newspaper in the State has insisted more earnestly than the Petersburg Index-Appeal on the right of each party to manage its own affairs for itself, without interference of any sort from outside. It is, therefore, with considerable surprise that we find this contemporary speaking tolerantly if not approvingly of the voting of Republicans in Democratic primaries. In what way could one party interfere more decisively with the affairs of another than by entering into, influencing and possibly controlling its nominations?

A nomination by the Democratic party in this State is equivalent to an election. Republicans have nothing to lose by temporarily Democratizing themselves for an object and promising to support the nominees of a Democratic primary, since their own candidate, if they put forward any at all, is known to have no chance. To admit them to participation is simply to open the door to them to name the successful candidate. This is the party argument why nothing of the sort should be considered. But there is a deeper argument, the argument of common honesty. To get into a Democratic primary, a Republican must pretend that he is a Democrat; otherwise he would not be admitted; and such a pretense is not considered honest hereabouts. This talk of Republican abuse of Democratic primaries has arisen in the congressional campaign in the Fourth District. In this struggle the Index-Appeal favors, we believe, Hon. Charles T. Lassiter. What would our contemporary think if Mr. Lassiter should go down in defeat, and it could be shown that he was beaten solely by the votes of lifelong Republicans, now and hereafter, who only changed feet momentarily for the express purpose of defeating Mr. Lassiter? Would it really think that his successful opponent had fairly and properly won a Democratic nomination? We venture to believe not.

The Times-Dispatch has expressed the opinion that Republican intruders in Democratic primaries are morally committing fraud. It must stand by this opinion, even though our Petersburg contemporary says that sentiment in its section is not in accord with such a view. But, besides the morals of it, there is also a formal or technical side. The Index-Appeal surprises us by saying:

Undoubtedly many white Republicans will participate in this primary, as they have a right to do under the primary plan.

Have they such a right? Where did they get it? The only primary plan in existence in Virginia is that adopted at the Democratic State Convention of 1904. This plan lays down the qualifications of participants as follows:

All white Democrats who are, or will be, legal voters at the election . . . shall be entitled to vote at the primary election held to nominate a party senatorial candidate; and at all other primary elections hereinafter provided for [which includes congressional elections] all white Democrats who are, or who will be, legal voters at the election next following the primary shall be entitled to vote at such primary.

How have Republicans, white or otherwise, the "right" to vote in a primary clearly confined by party law to white Democrats?

Senator Parks's bill prohibiting football in Virginia and making the playing of it punishable by a fine for a first conviction and thirty days in jail for a second, is not at all likely to pass. At the same time it will certainly command enough support among our Solons to show that clear-cut and deep-seated opposition was aroused by the tragedies which threw a pall over the last football season in Virginia. With these general sentiments we are in full sympathy. But we do not think that the present Legislature should make football-playing a misdemeanor, believing that the reformers should be given one more chance, and that if they leave the game still overdangerous, the colleges should act rather than the State. The intercollegiate rules committee, headed by Walter Camp, has gone at its task sincerely and earnestly, and they should have an opportunity to save the game if they can. Some time ago Mr. Camp proposed that the University of Virginia athletic authorities should co-operate with his committee in trying out the proposed new rules and formations on Lambeth Field. The suggestion was an admirable one, and we hope to see it carried out. A series of informal test games would do for the proposed changes what laboratory work does for the chemistry student. It would help everybody to reach some sort of opinion as to what revised football is going to be like.

Got any urgency defficiency bills at your house this morning?

A news item in a Baltimore paper tells us that "a 141-year-old boy was shot through the heart while playing cowboy." We wonder what would be their idea of an adolescent in Baltimore anyway.

We should take the off-hand opinion of the rough-and-ready masses to be that a man who did not have to spend so much time denying would really be more useful at the head of the Interior Department.

The papers report that Dr. Cook "has arranged for a strictly incognito stay" near Heidelburg, which looks reasonably cognito to us.

We could name two famous Republicans who are likely to think much better of Governor Hughes since he disowned any and all presidential bees.

Picked out your Ballinger-Pinchot committee yet?

State Press on Major Hemphill

An Event in Virginia Journalism.

The accession to the editorial chair of the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Major J. C. Hemphill is an event in Virginia journalism. As conductor of the Charleston News and Courier Major Hemphill has achieved a reputation for ability not by any means confined to his State or section. For twenty years the paper under his guidance has consistently battled for all that is best in the principles and traditions of Democracy. In him no good cause has lacked a fearless champion and no public evil been without open rebuke. In his writings the major displays the force of a robust mind and the graces of one thoroughly cultivated. He comes as a welcome reinforcement to the brotherhood in Virginia. The Times-Dispatch is to be congratulated and Richmond will gain a citizen distinguished no less by professional talent than by personal virtues and attractive qualities.—Norfolk Virginian-Pilot.

One of Ablest Southern Editors.

The interesting announcement is made that Major J. C. Hemphill, of the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier, will succeed Henry S. Harrison as chief editorial writer on the Richmond Times-Dispatch. Major Hemphill is one of the ablest editors in the South, and he will add dignity and strength to any paper he is connected with.—Petersburg Index-Appeal.

Among Nation's Best Known Writers.

All Virginia will be interested in the announcement that Major J. C. Hemphill, the distinguished editor of the Charleston News and Courier, is coming to Virginia to be editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch. "Deacon" Hemphill, as he usually is called by his contemporaries, is one of the best known editors not only in the South, but in the country. He ranks along with Colonel Henry Watterson, of the Louisville Courier-Journal; consequently the Charleston News and Courier has enjoyed a position in the newspaper world that probably no other paper of its class in the country can boast of. Major Hemphill has been editor of the News and Courier for twenty years, having succeeded the late F. W. Dawson. He is vice-president of the Associated Press. This spring he will deliver at Yale and Cornell lectures on "Journalism."—Newport News Press.

His Coming an Event of Interest.

An important change is announced to take place on the Richmond Times-Dispatch about February 15, at that time Major J. C. Hemphill, for many years and at present editor of the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier, will become editor-in-chief of The Times-Dispatch. Major Hemphill is one of the ablest and best known writers in Southern journalism, and his coming to Virginia will be an event of interest.—Bristol Herald-Courier.

Virginia Fortunate to Get Him.

A great and pleasant surprise is furnished by the Richmond Times-Dispatch in the announcement that, beginning February 15, Major J. C. Hemphill, now the editor of the Charleston News and Courier, will assume charge of the editorial page of our Richmond contemporary. Major Hemphill is, next to Colonel Henry Watterson, probably the best known editor in the United States, and he is certainly one of the very ablest. He is strictly true to the truest Southern traditions, and possesses a distinct and remarkable individuality, both of person and editorial style. Virginia is fortunate to get him away from South Carolina, and the Landmark is glad to have an old friend closer than ever.—Norfolk Landmark.

STATE PRESS

Governor Swanson's Equalization Plan.

There is no doubt about the crying need of reform in the mode of assessing property throughout the State, but the Governor's suggestion of the remedy for this evil strikes us as crude and ineffective and one which might result in injustice and a vast increase in litigation between the State and its citizens, a thing to be avoided if possible. We regret therefore that we cannot give to this portion of the message the unqualified approval which we cheerfully accord to the other recommendations made by the Governor.—Henry Bulletin.

The Shoe Contract and Good Roads.

Governor Swanson intimated a few days ago that the policy of the State would be against renewing the contract with the Davis Shoe Company, whereby that concern is to have the use of convict labor in the manufacture of shoes in the penitentiary as at present. There appears to be a strong sentiment in favor of the convicts being put to work on the public roads so that all the people, and not one concern, will be benefited. In the manufacture of shoes the convicts come in contact with honest labor, which is objectionable to a large per cent. of the people. The convict problem is not an easy one to solve, but it is our candid opinion that there are a sufficient number of shoe factories in the United States to supply the people, while there is a shortage of help in road building. One hundred convicts employed on the roads of a single county would soon put the roads in splendid condition. In this way road improvement could be carried on in a dozen or more counties at the same time, and in a few years Virginia would enjoy the reputation of having the best roads of any State in the Union. Naturally there are people who oppose convict labor on the roads, but the men in prison cannot be kept in idleness, and the best solution as we see it is to stop them from making shoes and put them to making good roads. The short term prisoners are now employed on the roads, and so far there have been splendid results. With common labor at a premium, we believe it would be economy to employ convicts on the roads, and the sooner the better. As matters now stand, Virginia is not making the progress in road construction that the situation demands.—Covington Dispatch.

The Committee's Primary Plan.

The Democratic voters demand a clean, strong, legalized primary law. The machine has ever opposed the primary plan, and has been unceasing in its efforts to discredit the primary system. The primary bill adopted by the subcommittee, over which State Chairman Ellyson presided, is a most brazen attempt at the very life of the primary, for, in effect, it is a bill to legalize fraud, instead of legalizing the primary. The people will not be satisfied with any subterfuge; what they want is a sound and comprehensive law—a law in which the will of the voter will be honestly recorded. The complicated methods employed by the machine to dissatisfy the advocates of the primary method has, and may yet, cause delay, but some day we will have a real primary law, for the people are in earnest.—Culpeper Enterprise.

Senator Strode's Tax Commission Bill.

Senator Strode, of Amherst, who has given study to the taxation question, has presented a bill to the Virginia Legislature for the creation of a State tax commission. It provides for a commission to consist of twelve members. The president of the Senate, the Speaker and the chairmen of both branches constitute the first four members, and they are to select the remaining eight, seeing that each section of the State is represented in the commission as finally made up. The compensation is the per diem of ordinary legislative committees. The duty of the commission is to collect facts concerning the taxable property of the Commonwealth and to report such legislation as it may see fit, basing its judgment on the facts presented to them. We believe this a better procedure for definite results than the plan proposed by the Governor in his message—to have the State Auditor approve and supervise assessments. The Governor's plan has brought more criticism than any other of his suggestions; in fact, it is about the only recommendation that has had disapproval throughout the State.—Roanoke Evening World.

"It must be very dangerous to go up in an airship," said an admirer.

"Not at all," answered the aviator, "why I used to ride one of those high-wheel bicycles."—Buffalo Express.

* * *

Lieutenant Shackleton says the penguin is one of the most intelligent members of the bird family. And the nature fakers in this country are too cowed and discouraged to dispute him.—Denver Republican.

* * *

The whole trouble with President Taft seems to be that he allows his good intentions to be edited by bad advisers.—Dallas News.

Our policy is to increase the pulling power of your advertising. Our staff is composed of experts.
Richmond Advertising Agency, Inc.
Mutual Building,
Richmond, Virginia.
Established 1904.

BARONET CHUM OF TOM BROWN

He Was Sir Charles Strickland, Member of a Prominent Family.

DEVELOPMENT OF SOUDAN

Emperor Attaches Importance to Perfect Dancing at State Balls.

BY LA MARQUISE DE FONTENOY.

EVERY boy who has read "Tom Brown's Schooldays" will remember the lad who figures therein as the hero's chum, Martin. The real name of the latter was Strickland. He was Sir Charles Strickland, eighth baronet of his line, and he has just succumbed to an attack of influenza, the first illness in his life, at the age of ninety-one, enjoying such vigorous health until almost the last that his ninetieth birthday was spent in the hunting field, following the hounds over ditches and hedges. He was a great character, a Tory of the old school, who entertained a most profound contempt for present-day politics—a contempt which was so pronounced that he would not even go to the polls—and some years ago, when a Conservative agent wrote to him asking for his vote, he replied in a letter, which was given out for publication, to the effect: "I do not know who has been so impertinent as to put my name on any list of voters. I only hope that no one will ever imagine that the miserable and degraded house which has ceased to be a deliberative assembly, and in which no one can honestly express his opinion without being in danger of the gag, in any way represents me."

The family, which has for nearly 1,000 years borne as its crest a bird which is described in old heraldic phraseology as "a turkey cock in its pride," was settled in Westmoreland long before the Norman Conquest. A member of the house, William Strickland, accompanied Sebastian Cabot in his voyages of discovery to the New World, and on his becoming too old for a life of adventure, settled down at Boynton Hall, in Yorkshire, where his descendant, Sir Charles Strickland, has just died, and which has been in uninterrupted possession of the family ever since. A Sir Thomas Strickland bore the banner of St. George at the battle of Agincourt; and a Walter Strickland enjoyed the favor of Oliver Cromwell, who called him to "the other house of Parliament" as Lord Strickland. Miss Agnes Strickland, the historian, and the author of "The Queens of England" and of "The Queens of Scotland," was a member of this ancient house.

Still another member of the family is Sir Gerald Strickland, now Governor of Tasmania and owner of Sizergh Castle, in Westmoreland, which came to the Stricklands through the marriage of Sir Robert Strickland to the heiress of Sir Ralph Deincourt in the reign of King Henry III. Sir Gerald is married to Lady Edeline Sackville, sister of the Earl of De La Warr, and has inherited both the beautiful Villa Bologna, in Malta, and the title of Count della Catena, from his maternal uncle. The title of Count della Catena is a Maltese one, and was created in 1745 by the Grand Master of the Sovereign Order of the Knights of Malta, in favor of Peter Bologna, with succession to the heir, under perpetual entail, to whom the estates of Peter Bologna in the Island of Malta should descend. Sir Gerald has received the permission of the crown to use the title of Della Catena.

Sir Reginald Wingate Is Severely Ill.

General Sir Reginald Wingate's serious illness at Cairo, is likely to force him to surrender the command of the Egyptian army and the governor-generalship of the Soudan, both of which offices he had held for a little over a decade. When he was placed in supreme authority in the Soudan, in December, 1899, just a month after his final defeat of the Mahdi who was killed in the battle, the revenue of the country amounted to $600,000. To-day the revenue of this vast territory, embracing over 1,000,000 square miles, exceeds $5,000,000, and the revenue will still further increase by leaps and bounds when the railroads now in course of construction in several directions have been completed and are in a position to bring to market the produce of the fertile districts which they are designed to tap. This, and the fact that the slave trade has been entirely abolished throughout the Soudan, speaks for itself and renders any further relation of the work done by Sir Reginald in his capacity as Governor-General of this great Anglo-Egyptian dominion, unnecessary.

Sir Reginald first won his spurs as chief of the intelligence department of the Egyptian army, when it was under the command of Lord Kitchener, and as such he organized the marvelous and dramatic escape of his Austrian friend, General Rudolf Slatin Pasha, from the captivity in which this former lieutenant and associate of Gordon was held by the Khalifa at Khartoum.

Attaches Importance to Dancing.

Emperor William's appointment of two young officers of the Garde du Corps, Count Wedel and Baron von Knyphausen, as "Vortanzer," for the season of festivities now in progress at the court of Berlin, serves once more to emphasize the importance which he attaches to perfect dancing at the state balls. These vortanzers are intrusted with the duty of opening the various round dances, and after that, of supervising the other dancers, calling off superfluous couples if the floor is too crowded, and quietly eliminating from the dance any guest whose terpsichorean skill is not up to the mark. Not long after his accession to the throne, the Emperor, angered by the many tumbles on the highly polished and parqueted floors of the royal and imperial palaces, summoned the generals commanding the various troops stationed in and around Berlin, and instructed them to direct those officers who were not able to dance properly, to abstain from attempting to do so at the imperial entertainments. Since then, young officers have always been put through their paces by their seniors, and have to display a certain proficiency in dances around the billiard or mess table before they are allowed to dance at court. Thanks to this, falls are far less frequent than formerly.

It was a contretemps of this kind, in connection with which an awkward officer brought Empress Frederick to the floor at a state ball at Berlin only a few weeks after her marriage that caused her mother-in-law, the late Empress Augusta, to banish the waltz from the list of dances at all court entertainments, the prohibition remaining in force until her death, some time after the accession of William II. to the throne. She declared that she could not tolerate a dance which would place a princess of the blood in such an undignified position as that in which she had seen her English daughter-in-law when sprawling at her feet. Even other round dances require care to avoid mishaps, and on one occasion during the reign of old Emperor William, a young subaltern, who was unfortunate enough to trip up his partner, and to come to the floor with her, at a court ball at Berlin, was assailed so bitterly by the late Prince Frederick Charles, surnamed "the Red Prince," that Emperor Frederick, then Crown Prince, was obliged to intervene.

At a Viennese court ball, a young secretary of the Roumanian legation fell so unfortunately when dancing with one of the archduchesses that he actually came down in a sitting position on her face, causing her imperial nose to bleed. It need scarcely be added that he left the Austrian capital the next day, and a week later obtained a transfer to another post. A short time before the tragedy at Meyerling, Crown Princess Stephanie had a very nasty fall, owing to the gaucherie of a cavalry officer with whom she was waltzing. Emperor Francis Joseph was terribly annoyed, and Crown Prince Rudolf spoke his mind in no measured tones to the offender.

Far more polite was Napoleon III, at the Tuileries, when a middle-aged officer and his fair partner came to grief. As the mortified warrior scrambled to his feet, the Emperor extended a hand to help him, and turning to the lady, remarked, "Madame, this is the second time that I have seen the colonel fall. The first time was on the battlefield of Magenta."

(Copyright, 1910, by the Brentwood Company.)

Daily Queries and Answers

Address all communications for this column to Query Editor, Times-Dispatch. No mathematical problems will be solved, no coins or stamps valued and no dealers' names will be given.

Woman's Suffrage.

Can you give us the addresses of the parties from which we could get material on the question of woman suffrage? R. H. L.

Write to the secretary of the Equal Suffrage League, 307 East Franklin Street, Richmond, Va. We feel sure you can secure information from this body.

Arbor Day for Emporia.

The Civic Improvement League of this place is preparing for an Arbor Day. I should appreciate very much your giving me the names of a few responsible nurserymen, and any advice you can see fit to offer. A. W.

If you will send us a self-addressed stamped envelope we would be glad to give you the desired names. We would suggest, however, that it would be more appropriate for you to select your trees from the forests around Emporia. They would then have a local interest. It would be well for you to have some general exercises on Arbor Day and forward the general work of your valuable league by a public celebration.

Automobile Laws.

1. Please give me some information through your Query Column about the automobile law. Is it a United States law, or is it divided up into State laws?

2. Can a person get damages paid after receiving help from the occupants? A READER.

1. There is no automobile law for the United States, except that covering the District of Columbia. Each State has its own automobile law.

2. The mere fact that you received aid from the occupants of an automobile would not necessarily estop you from securing punitive or actual damages.

Per Capita Wealth.

Which city has the most wealth per capita, Richmond or Lynchburg, Va.? A SUBSCRIBER.

According to statistics issued a year or two ago, Lynchburg had the greatest wealth per capita in the United States. Richmond stood third.

Photographer Wanted.

Please publish in The Times-Dispatch the nearest photographers who will fix old plates after they have been exposed, and what they charge. M. K. W.

We suppose you wish the plates developed. You will find a number of firms advertising in the columns of the daily and Sunday Times-Dispatch who do this work.

The Old Ladies' Home.

Can you give me information in regard to entering the Old Ladies' Home, and the address of same? READER.

Inasmuch as you do not say what old ladies' home you wish to enter, we can only give you general information. In most cases these homes are under the direction of some denomination. Admission is secured on the recommendation of a particular church and the payment of a fee, generally not over $200. This fee will secure you a permanent place in the home.

Voice of the People.

A Strong Argument Against the Income Tax Amendment.

Editor of The Times-Dispatch:

Sir,—No more important matter will be submitted to the attention of the Virginia Legislature at this session than the question of the ratification of the proposed income tax amendment to the Federal Constitution, yet it has created little or no interest or comment amongst the people, or even in political circles. That the Legislature will ratify the amendment seems to be generally accepted as a foregone conclusion.

The purpose of this communication is to point out as briefly and concisely as possible certain objections to the amendment that appear to be very serious, or at least important enough to give pause to the people of Virginia before it is ratified.

I propose to consider only such objections as may be made to the amendment in the particular form in which it is presented to the States for ratification, though much might be said against its general policy.

The proposed amendment reads as follows: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

The Constitution at present provides that "direct taxes" shall be apportioned among the several States in proportion to their numbers, as fixed from time to time by the census, but that "duties and exercises," or "indirect taxes," shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Under this rule, if we suppose the United States to have a population of 90,000,000 people, of whom 3,000,000 reside in Virginia and 6,000,000 in New York, and Congress wishes to raise $90,000,000 by direct taxation, $3,000,000 of this sum must be levied in Virginia, and only $6,000,000 in New York, though New York possesses ten or fifteen times the wealth of Virginia. The rule is impossible of just application, and therefore direct taxation by the Federal government is now never attempted except in times of great distress.

So impressed were the early judges and law-givers with the impracticability of this rule governing direct taxation that, as early as 1796, in Hylton vs. United States, 3 Dall., 171, the Supreme Court of the United States held that no taxes were "direct," within the meaning of the Constitution, save only capitation (or poll) taxes and taxes on land, thus exempting from the rule taxes on personal property and on incomes, which were subject, as indirect taxes, to the rule of uniformity, instead of to that of apportionment.

After a century of such decisions, the announcement, in 1895, that the Supreme Court, in the famous income tax case, had reversed its rulings, and had held that an act of Congress taxing incomes uniformly throughout the country was void, because a tax on incomes was a direct tax, and as such subject to the rule of apportionment, came with a shock of surprise and consternation.

The effect of the decision was to destroy the right of Congress to tax incomes except under the impracticable rule of apportionment applicable to direct taxes; and the general purpose of the proposed amendment is to restore to Congress the power to tax incomes without regard to the rule of apportionment. But it seeks to do this, not by declaring an income tax an "indirect tax" (which was the view held prior to 1895), and therefore subject to the constitutional rule of uniformity applicable to such taxes, but (leaving it a direct tax) by exempting it from the rule of apportionment.

The framers of the Federal Constitution considered that unless they restricted Congress as to its methods of levying taxes, it might be able to levy them without regard to justice, and hence they expressly provided that indirect taxes should be uniform throughout the United States. But, under the proposed amendment, the income tax is not made an indirect tax, and is not required to be uniform throughout the country. If the two provisions be read together, the inference seems clear that Congress is not required to levy the income tax uniformly, but may, if it sees fit, tax incomes in one section of the country, while exempting from taxation the incomes of persons in another section.

It is no reply to this objection that such action by Congress is improbable. Occasions have arisen in our history, and may arise again, when Congress might welcome the exercise of such a power. Not so reasoned our fathers when, not trusting to the good sense or to the good intentions of Congress, they rendered it forever impossible by constitutional restrictions for Congress to levy an indirect tax otherwise than uniformly. Can we do better than follow their example.

But grant for the moment that under no circumstances would Congress ever choose to levy the tax in a fashion so boldly partisan and unjust. It may accomplish the same end under cover of the exercise of a discretion as to the sources of income to be taxed. The proposed amendment confers the power to tax incomes, "from whatever source derived." These words must be given some meaning. They would certainly seem to mean one of two things: either that Congress, if it taxes incomes at all, must tax all income, no matter from what source derived, in which case it would have no power to exempt from the operation of the tax the moderate income of the poor man; or else that Congress has discretion to tax incomes derived from some sources and to exempt income derived from other sources.

If the latter be the correct construction, Congress will be given power to tax incomes derived from cotton or tobacco planting, or from farming or mining, while exempting incomes derived from other sources, nor is it difficult to conceive circumstances under which Congress, or a majority in Congress, might desire to exercise such discretion. The exercise of the discretion may operate to aggrandize one section of the country at the expense of another no less surely than has the tariff, or than would the bold taxing of incomes in one section and exempting them in another. The Virginia people need not to be told which section would be given the small end.

There is, however, another explanation of the phase, "from whatever source derived," which is probably the true one, and which, if true, would seem to furnish an equally strong argument against ratification.

Chief Justice Marshall, in McCulloch vs. Maryland, 4 Wheat, 316, had early laid it down as a principle—an axiom it might be called—of taxation under our dual system of government, that "the power to tax involves the power to destroy," and hence that the Federal government has no power under the Constitution to tax the agencies of State governments, and vice versa. In the income tax case of 1895, the Supreme Court had applied this principle, and had declared that the act of Congress taxing incomes, so far as it taxed incomes derived from interest on State and municipal bonds, was void, because it was a tax on the power of the State and the cities (which are governmental agencies of the States) to borrow money, and that if Congress had power to tax it at all, it might tax it out of existence.

This principle would still have applied, if the amendment had conferred upon Congress only a general power to tax incomes. It is believed that the real and most important function of the words "from whatever source derived" is to bestow upon Congress the power to tax income derived from such bonds. If Marshall's axiom still holds good, and "the power to tax involves the power to destroy," as has abundantly been shown by the Federal tax on State banks of issue, then will the Legislature of Virginia be committing the lamb to the kindly care of the wolf if it votes to ratify the amendment.

And after all, it may be asked, what will be gained by the amendment? The answer, in large part at least, is that the Republican Congress, in the prosecution of its policy of high protection, has reached the point where the high duties are causing importations of many articles to fall off seriously or to cease altogether, and this, together with its increasing extravagance, has created a deficit; and unless the States ratify the amendment, Congress must either lay more reasonable duties, or else must economize, neither of which is agreeable to the party in power. The people are asked to come to the rescue, and to enable them to continue their policy. Will the State of Virginia violate its traditional views of a century, in order to help the Republican administration out of the hole it has dug for itself, at the expense of its own people, who are far more losers than gainers by the Republican policy of high protection?

If the argument be made that the Democratic party is pledged to an income tax amendment, it may at least be replied that it is not pledged to this particular one, or to any that may be found to be objectionable or unwise.

Just as I am about to mail this, I note your editorial of January 8, referring to Governor Hughes's objections to the amendment along some of the lines above mentioned, and which you answer by declaring that Congressmen would fear to vote for an income tax law destructive of the power of the States and cities to borrow money. It is difficult to look into the future and pronounce definitely what a majority in Congress may or may not do under stress of political exigencies, especially when the majority is sectional, as in the United States. It is not so difficult, in view of our past history, to conceive that a sectional majority in the United States, desirous, we will say, to pass an amendment to the Constitution opposed by the weaker section, might use this as a weapon against the opponents of the measure, especially if they could take advantage of the fact that the taxation is not required to be uniform throughout the country.

I have not seen Governor Hughes's objections to the amendment, except as you refer to them in your editorial, but one cannot but agree with him in asking why ratify this particular amendment, when one may be so easily drawn that would overcome these objections? RALEIGH C. MINOR.

The University of Virginia.

PROTECT yourself against sudden attacks of chills, Colds and Grippe by keeping the system strong and healthy and the digestion normal. To do this, take

HOSTETTER'S CELEBRATED STOMACH BITTERS