The Times-Dispatch

DAILY—WEEKLY—SUNDAY.

Business Office.....916 E. Main Street
South Richmond.....1103 Hull Street
Petersburg Bureau.....109 N. Sycamore Street
Lynchburg Bureau.....217 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) 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.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1910.

THE "WORDING" OF TAFT.

According to the veracious Baltimore Sun, John A. Stewart, president of the Associated Republican Clubs of New York, appeared at Beverly yesterday with a message, probably an ultimatum or something of the sort, for the President from the Colonel. Last week the Colonel spoke plainly to Mr. Stewart "of the necessity of Republicans getting together to meet the Democratic wave rising all over the country," and when Stewart told him that he was going to see the President about a personal matter "he suggested that I put it up strong to the President to come forward with an expression of his views on national matters that in their wording shall correspond with Mr. Roosevelt's sentiments."

Well, what do you think of that? Did you ever? Did anybody ever? Mr. Taft, who has a saving sense of humor, will doubtless enjoy the message delivered through the mouth of that faithful apostle of Humbug, John A. Stewart; but he could no more make his "wording" correspond with "Mr. Roosevelt's sentiments" on national matters than he could fly. On the essentials, they are as far apart as East and West. Take the President's letter to Associate Justice Moody accepting his resignation, and in which he expresses his view of the Supreme Court. "One who has tasted the sweets of judicial life," says Mr. Taft, "can sympathize with you deeply in this," the ending of his career on the Bench. "The approaching of every question for decision with indifference to every consideration except to reach a right and just conclusion and to preserve the fundamental structure of our Government as our fathers gave it to us makes the functions of the office most precious to one who feels in every fibre, as you do, their sacred importance."

We like the "wording" of Taft better than the wording of his would-be mentor. It is the difference between a responsible citizen and a madman, between the Law and the Mob. Yet the message sent by Mr. Stewart is wholly characteristic and selfishly political. It means that the Democratic wave is about to sweep the Republicans off their feet, that the Colonel is looking for a soft place to fall, and that he has already made up his inventive and dishonest mind to lay the blame on Taft. It will be the easiest possible thing for him to say later it is all over that if my advice had been followed, if Taft had only done what I told him to do, the Republicans would not have suffered this defeat.

THE MILL TAX.

Secretary Charles G. Maphis, of the Virginia Education Commission, yesterday presented a very able report to that body on a mill tax for the educational system of Virginia. It was well received, and the suggestions which are made are sound and present a most feasible scheme "for a stable and systematic method for the maintenance of a State school system." The plan advanced by the report seems to be a practical solution of several of the problems which have hitherto beset educators in Virginia.

The mill tax is a fixed tax of a certain number of mills on the taxable property of the State for educational purposes. The report made yesterday proposes such a tax on the property of Virginia from which the school revenue is derived shall be in lieu of all the annual appropriations for purposes heretofore made for this from the State treasury." It is not a tax to be created in the future, is simply a permanent tax levied on a fixed basis from the same sources.

States have adopted this system for maintenance and twenty-eight-three State universities and other institutions of education are supported wholly by such a tax. Without exception those who have observed the working of this tax declare it satisfactory. Theory and practice on this point very nicely. The reasons given for preference of this method of support to that of others are:

The schools and colleges have a policy to be in force indefinitely permits them to make larger and wiser plans for future work, to plan ahead wisely there is the stable expectation of income will be available for use. The tax amounts to a percentage with the State behind it.

The constantly increasing wealth of the State means more of the educational fund, increase and in proportion to the growth and needs of the State.

Richmond is tied to the business efficiency of the institution. The institution, however, is less subject to business embarrassment caused by legislative caprice.

It provides a stable income in times of panic or other depressing financial activities.

It prevents lobbying by the authorities of the various schools at the session of the General Assembly and reduces the unpleasant rivalry between the institutions clamoring for money for their respective needs.

It relieves the General Assembly and its committees from much labor and annoyance, taking away from them the trouble of worrying over the amount of appropriations for the various institutions.

It saves the time and preserves the dignity of the school men who have to lobby at the session of the General Assembly.

Under the plan which Secretary Maphis suggests, a percentage of the total gross revenues of the State will not be set aside, but the sources of revenue now used for school revenue will be the sole sources. This plan takes in the whole educational system, recognizing its unity. It still leaves to the public elementary schools the capitation tax and the revenues from the Literary Fund. It will not interfere with the specific portions set aside for pensions or the militia.

The plan here suggested has many advantages and it creates no additional amount of taxation upon the individual. It appears to be very practical, experience has shown it an excellent system, and by its adoption in Virginia much friction and waste of time and effort would be saved. Co-operation, rather than competition, among the educational institutions of the Commonwealth, will result, and the way will be paved for regular and healthy growth.

WASHINGTON AND THE PRESIDENCY.

Collier's Weekly, which is only a little less irresponsible and humorous than the Output, has been trying to prove that George Washington was not opposed to a third term for the Presidency or for any number of terms.

As a matter of fact, Washington would not consent to become a candidate for a third term and his views on the subject will be found expressed in one of Jefferson's letters to Madison in which he says that at a Cabinet meeting "the President (Washington) was much inflamed; got into one of those passions when he cannot command himself; ran on much of the personal abuse which had been bestowed on him; defied any man on earth to produce a single act of his since he had been in the government which was not done on the purest motives; that he had never repented but once the having slipped the moment of resigning his office, and that was every moment since, that, by God, he had rather be in his grave than in his present situation. That he had rather be on his farm than to be made emperor of the world, and yet that they were charging him with wanting to be a king."

Not only was Washington opposed to a third term in the office of President, but he was "reluctantly drawn" into his first and second terms, and, indeed, prepared an address at the close of his first term expressing his disinclination to be a candidate for reelection. In his "Farewell Address," which is filled with the counsels of an old and affectionate friend, to his friends and fellow citizens, he commented upon the exercise of party spirit as subversive of the true spirit of liberty and uttered this note of warning and prophecy: "The disorders and miseries which result gradually (from the 'alternate domination of one faction over another') incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual, and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty."

THE CRADLE OF THE HONOR SYSTEM.

In a letter published elsewhere in this paper, Dr. Lyon Gardiner Tyler corrects us in our statement that the honor system among college students originated at the University of Virginia. William and Mary College, according to his declaration, was the cradle of this system, and strong evidence sustains his contentions. It would appear from contemporaneous testimony that this system began at William and Mary about 1779, many years before the founding of the University of Virginia, where the working of the system has attracted so much attention.

It was under the administration of James Madison, D. D., that the honor system began at the historic institution at Williamsburg, the alma mater of so many good men and great. In an address delivered by Judge Nathaniel Beverley Tucker in 1834 to his law classes, afterward published in the Southern Literary Messenger, that eminent Virginian asserted that one of the most striking things about William and Mary College was the honor system, which he said had prevailed there for many years. "The honor of the student is the only witness to which we appeal," he said. A statute passed by the college in 1830, which doubtless only served to formulate the spirit existent in William and Mary for many a year previous, declared that when a student was charged with an offense some member of the faculty should approach him in a kindly manner and ask him whether he was guilty. If the student denied "on his honor" that he was guilty, he was conclusively presumed to be innocent, "because the Convocation is satisfied that no student will degrade himself by a falsehood and that an appeal to his honor will never be made in vain."

An additional witness to the primacy of William and Mary is Dr. Edward S. Joynes, emeritus professor of modern languages at the University of South Carolina, an alumnus of the University of Virginia, a member of the faculty of Washington College when General Lee was president, and one of the foremost scholars in the United States.

In a letter to a contemporary, Dr. Joynes writes of the honor system:

Of course, as you truly say, this honor system did not "have its origin" in the University of Virginia—my own dear alma mater, which I always love to praise. It existed in the South Carolina college before the University of Virginia was founded. It existed, and was fully recognized, in William and Mary College, Virginia, long before either of these institutions was thought of. Its "origin," if it ever had any, was in the sentiments and traditions prevailing in Southern homes, transferred, as you say, to the sphere of college life. It is now, so far as I know, universal in Southern colleges, and is justly regarded in all of them, by both students and faculty, as among their proudest traditions.

The wonder is that such a system, so simple and, one would think, so natural, should not be universal; but in many of our greatest institutions of the North and West it is unknown—or known only to be distrusted and ridiculed!

A few years ago a distinguished gentleman, well known in the world of education, brought me a letter of introduction. I was engaged in conducting the final examination of a large class in French. My visitor expressed regret that he could not see the president. "I will go with you," said I. "But," said he, "you cannot leave your examination." "O, yes," I replied, "these men need no watching; they will watch themselves better than I could do it"—and I went with him. He expressed, again and again, his profound astonishment; such a thing, he said, would be impossible at ——, naming a great university, whose examinations were closely watched by monitors appointed for the purpose.

Such a system means naturally distrust and suspicion on the one side, and evasion and trickery on the other. If the student is told that he is not trusted, there is no appeal to his sense of honor. It is simply a game of "catch as catch can," and at such a game against a faculty the students always win.

Dare I add publicly what I have long thought on this subject? Rather let me ask: How far the startling and disgraceful prevalence of graft, bribery, etc., in high places may be the natural result of a college system which teaches, practically, that the only dishonor is in being caught?

Honor to William and Mary for originating such a system, and honor to the other colleges which have followed in so excellent a path! The extension of the system to the public schools would be a tremendous step forward in the cause of public honesty!

CHARLES HUTZLER.

A leader in the civic affairs of Richmond lies stricken as the result of a most painful accident yesterday, and the sympathy of the people of the city goes out to him. It is no common anxiety which is universally felt here for the recovery for Charles Hutzler, for sincere regret at his serious condition is not confined to those who are near and dear to him, or to the legion of his friends and acquaintances, but is experienced by the citizens generally. The invisible chord of a city's sympathy has been touched by the calamity which has befallen it in this serious injury to one of its most valuable citizens.

The heartfelt prayer of our people will be for a speedy return to health for Mr. Hutzler. He is too splendid a citizen for Richmond to lose, and our hope is that for many years he may be spared to continue in the good works which are a noble testimonial to his efficient citizenship. Honored by the members of Beth Ahabah synagogue who have bestowed upon him the presidency of their congregation, a leader in charitable and social service as his position as head of the Laurel Reformatory attests, and conspicuous in public affairs for many years as a member of the City School Board, of which for two years he has been president, Mr. Hutzler has, in all these capacities wrought wisely and well for this community. He is possessed of the fine qualities which constitute the valuable citizen, he has taken an active part in the educational development of the city, he has shown himself a publicist of rare worth. Let us hope that in due season he may again be with us, unimpaired in his physical powers and with his mental energy undiminished. Richmond watches solicitously for his speedy recovery.

LIMITATIONS ON THE TERM OF TREASURERS.

In an interview printed yesterday in this paper, the Hon. J. M. Lewis, a member of the House of Delegates from King and Queen and Essex, took a very commendable and a very wise attitude as to the four proposed amendments to the Constitution of Virginia. He is not against all of these propositions, but he is going to vote against them all and he is right about it. Hear Mr. Lewis on his reason:

"I believe the majority of the people of my section who have discussed the matter are opposed to the amendments to the Constitution.

"Personally, I am inclined to think that an extension of the session of the General Assembly to ninety days would work to the advantage of the public, in giving longer time for the consideration of State questions. But I am so much opposed to the amendment allowing treasurers to succeed themselves indefinitely that I am willing to see them all defeated if there is any danger that the voters will become confused as between the propositions."

It is on account of the financial welfare of the cities and counties that Delegate Lewis would continue in force the present Constitutional provision inhibiting treasurers from holding office more than two successive terms. He rightly describes the settlement of "hold-over treasurers" as a "paper settlement" for that is just what it has been shown to be in many cases. Probably it has been the case in many instances that have not been brought to light, and never will be brought to light.

In other words, the settlement is not an actual settlement. A clever manipulator of funds can, at the end of a term, if he is going to succeed himself, present a paper settlement that will be satisfactory in every way, apparently. He has, say, several separate funds in his custody. He has, let us assume, misused and spent money from one of these funds. The day comes for him to settle with the authorities having direction of that fund. The treasurer can simply take money from any other of his fund accounts and show a certificate of deposit that will look all right. It is passed on as all right. Suppose he accounts on another day for another fund. He takes the same money and makes out that it belongs to this second fund. In this way he could take $2,000 and make balances that would show $10,000 or $12,000. How can such misuse of funds be prevented?

If he is allowed to succeed himself term after term, he can keep on doing this, and the longer he stays in the office the deeper in "the hole" goes the county through the treasurer's rascality.

On the other hand, limit this term, and you make him settle in actual cash at the end of eight years—a reasonable time—and in that way cut off the possibility of longer and greater misappropriations on his part.

This is a financial question. Hear on this point the Hon. George B. Keezell, of Rockingham, chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, for thirty years a member of the General Assembly, the chief authority on the finances of Virginia:

"The trouble, in my opinion, about every officer who handles the public money is this: So long as he believes that he is going to have a termination of his incumbency, he is careful about how he handles the public money, and he does not allow himself to labor under the delusion that the public money is his money. But when he has held a position for a long time by frequent re-elections, he comes to believe that the office belongs to him, and that he will be able to hold it indefinitely; then is the time when the public is in danger, and I am in favor of fixing, with absolute definiteness, the time when any official who handles public money shall not be able to hold the office by re-election."

No more correct statement on this question has ever been made.

If this propos d amendment which would give the treasurers unlimited tenure is passed, untold evils may result to the finances of cities and counties.

There is great danger that this proposed amendment may slip through. In order to kill it, the safest, the best thing to do is to do what Delegate Lewis is going to do—vote against them all.

TIME TO CALL A HALT.

Two more chapters have been added within almost twenty-four hours to the gruesome history of automobile accidents in this city. The tolerance of the people with existing conditions is about exhausted. On Tuesday night a Confederate veteran was dealt a death-blow by a motor car, the cowardly occupants of which are unknown. Hastily depositing the injured body of this aged man on the veranda of the hospital at the Soldiers' Home, afraid to inquire into the seriousness of his hurt, the driver of the car and its occupants scudded off under the cover of darkness and are concealing themselves from the reach of the law. The dying man spoke but a few words, but in this interval of speech he said that the car was moving at a great rate of speed and that it had plenty of room to pass him.

On yesterday morning one of the most prominent citizens of Richmond was struck down by an automobile and is seriously injured. It is said that "the force of the impact was sufficient to send the victim spinning through space to a spot some distance away. He struck the pavement and was knocked unconscious." This in the clear light of day, on one of the busiest streets of Richmond, at a point where there are usually a goodly number of pedestrians. According to one of the witnesses of the accident, the driver of the automobile was "guilty of gross carelessness" and was "inexcusable." It is said further that he "was running at a great rate of speed."

These recent instances of the dangerous use of automobiles suggest that it is time to call a halt on the fast and reckless driving of motor cars in Richmond. There have been three deaths here through automobile accidents in less than seven weeks.

The great mass of the people of this city who do not own motor cars are not the only ones who have something at stake while such abuse of automobiles lasts. The owners of automobiles are almost as much concerned. The people generally have the safety of life and limb involved, and the motorists risk the severe restrictions and penalties of a law enacted in response to the demand of an outraged and no longer patient people. If these abuses of the privileges on the public highways given to motorists continue, public sentiment will become so severe and so unrelenting that drastic laws will be enacted upon the subject of motoring which will bear heavily alike on the careful and reckless owners and drivers.

What is needed in Richmond is the full and sincere co-operation of the automobile owners with the city authorities in endeavoring to put a stop to unlawful speeding and reckless driving. All these interests should work together for this common purpose. Careful motor car owners and drivers should use every effort in their power to assist the authorities in apprehending and punishing violators of the automobile laws. The owners of automobiles who wish to do so can create a sentiment among themselves against infractions of the laws of the city and commonwealth, and if they will do this, they will do a great thing for reform in this direction.

Within reasonable limits, the use of an automobile is all right; it is the unreasonable use of it that is so reprehensible. A reasonable use of motor cars under reasonable regulations is what we are trying to have; but at the present rate, we shall soon have unreasonable regulation of automobiles because of the abuse of their present privileges by motorists.

The ceaseless efforts of the police authorities are of the highest importance; but until the authorities have the co-operation of local motorists in their endeavors to uphold the law, the motor car will continue to be the subject of unending wrangle, the object of tremendous popular opposition, and the source of danger to human life.

AEROPLANES.

The interest being taken in the Wright Aeroplane at the Virginia State Fair, will turn the public mind again to the consideration of the use of this wonderful invention for warfare. Only yesterday General Nelson A. Miles declared that he was satisfied that the aeroplane would ultimately prove a better coast defense than forts. The French manoeuvres have just shown that the aeroplane makes many military movements that were easily accomplished under the old system of warfare, utterly impracticable. An officer during the French manoeuvres was sent up to take observations, and, after a flight of an hour, at a height above musket range, the officer returned and reported that a squadron of cavalry was deploying at one point, probably to conceal another movement. Infantry were entrenched, while still further away was a brigade, accompanied by two sections of artillery, and two companies of infantry. All those the officer in the aeroplane saw, and it would have required an impossible amount of scouting to have secured the same information.

Modern troops, however, are learning to conceal themselves from the aeroplane spies, and during the late French manoeuvres troops hid themselves under brushwood, in the grass, and in the cornfield, or under any improvised cover that could be found. But troops that are hidden are not effective for warfare, and in an aeroplane that can outspeed an express train from Chicago to Springfield, can cover a vast amount of territory, and disclose a very wide field of operations.

It may be that the wars of the future will be carried on in the skies or in the bowels of the earth, but no war will be carried on successfully that does not have courageous soldiers. Weapons may change, but the heart of the man and his willingness to die will prove the final test of success, no matter what the implements of destruction may be.

FOR HOME CONSUMPTION.

Seeing that Mr. Roosevelt was at once the actor and the audience, the author and the work, the public and the platform, in the Saratoga convention, why was it that one of his splendid thoughts, prepared for Western consumption, was given to the honest citizens of New York?

In his Ossawatomie address Mr. Roosevelt said:

"It is particularly important that all moneys received or expended for campaign purposes should be publicly accounted for, not only after election, but before election as well."

At Saratoga he had a chance to enunciate that shining truth again, but the chance was not taken. For the Western farmers who have been encouraged to believe that Mr. Roosevelt holds the final word of truth and statesmanship, it was "particularly important that all moneys received or expended for campaign purposes should be publicly accounted for, not only after election, but before election as well."

This truth has recently dawned on Mr. Roosevelt, for when Mr. Bryan propounded the same question to him Mr. Roosevelt replied that while he was in favor of campaign publicity, the names of the contributors should never be divulged until after election. But then we must remember that Mr. Roosevelt was answering Mr. Bryan, and not whooping up a Western audience; also what sort of a figure would the Republican party cut if the railroad and express companies, or the trusts and sugar refiners, whom Mr. Roosevelt protected while he was President should see their names printed among the list of Republican contributors before the election?

Mr. Roosevelt was right; what is "especially important" for Kansas is the consummation of folly for New York.

If Senator N. B. Early, of Albemarle, is in the city this afternoon, the football people ought to give him a seat of honor. He tackled the anti-football bill in the General Assembly and we strongly suspect he was guilty of "holding."

There was a great double wedding reception in Due West last week to mark the home-coming of four happy hearts that beat as two. Among the "features" of the occasion, we are told by the Charlotte Chronicle, was "a classic vocal selection in Italian, which was highly appreciated." We have no doubt of it.

Hampton Institute is to receive $260,750 from the estate of the late Miss Alice Byington, of Stockbridge, Massachusetts, who died about three years ago. This is a splendid gift to a most deserving school, and it will doubtless be used to the best purpose by the managers of the Institute.

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.

Automobiles vs. Motorcycles.

Please answer the following questions:

1. Which can run the fastest, an automobile or a motorcycle?
2. What are the records of both?

H. W.

1. Ordinarily the automobile in racing.
2. There are many pages of these records. Specify for what distance you wish comparative records.

Subsidy for Triplets.

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph D., of "near" this place, have recently had born to them triplets—a boy and two girls. Is there not a fund somewhere provided for help in such cases? They are worthy, but poor. If you can put me in touch with such society or fund it will help those who deserve. A HELPER.

We know of no such society or fund. An appeal for aid might secure response from Theodore Roosevelt, Oyster Bay, N. Y., who is an especial and enthusiastic patron of triplets.

Richmond's Population.

Will you kindly publish the white and negro population of Richmond, according to the 1910 census?

"CONSTANT READER."

This information has not yet been given out.

LORD GREVILLE ON VISIT TO AMERICA

BY DA MARQUISE DE FONTENOY.

LORD GREVILLE, who arrived yesterday on board the Mauretania with his American wife, daughter of John W. Grace, of New York, and widow of the late Henry S. Kerr, of that city, succeeded to his father's peerage last winter, a few weeks only after his marriage. He went through the Boer War as captain of the Seventh Hussars, and has seen some colonial service as military secretary to Lord Northcote, when the latter was Governor of Bombay, and afterwards Governor-General of Australia. He represents the junior line of that family of Greville of which the Earl of Warwick is the chief, and is a son of that Lady Greville whose name is familiar to many American readers through her letters on fashion in the London Graphic and in other English and also in some American papers. She is a daughter of the late Duke of Montrose, and is a tall and distinguished looking woman, who, although she writes on etiquette, on which she is recognized as an authority, nevertheless makes an odd mistake by styling herself "Lady Violet Greville," as though to remind every one that she is a daughter of a duke. According to strict English etiquette, the daughter of a duke or marquis who marries a baron, such as the late Lord Greville, loses, ipso facto, the rank and precedence of her birth, her status being that of her husband. It is only if she had married a commoner that she could have retained her rank and precedence as a duke's daughter, and her Christian name, preceded by the title of "Lady" and followed by the patronymic of her husband. It may be remembered that Sir Edward Malet, long the British ambassador at Berlin, who married the sister of the present Duke of Bedford, declined to accept the peerage that was offered to him on two separate occasions, on the ground that it would entail his wife's loss of her rank and precedence as a duke's daughter. The widowed Lady Greville's correct and official designation is not therefore "Lady Violet Greville," but "Violet, Lady Greville," the present Lord Greville's American wife being "the" Lady Greville.

The elder brother of Lord Greville, namely, "Ronnie" Greville, who died two years ago, predeceasing his father, was as enthusiastic a Conservative as the late Lord Greville was a Liberal and a Home Ruler, and when Ronnie was high sheriff for County Westmeath and the late Lord Greville was president of the Westmeath county Council, a battle royal took place between them on the subject of the Irish flag. Lord Greville, in his capacity as president of the county Council, claimed the right of flying the green flag over the county court house, at Mullingar, supported in the matter by the unanimous vote of the Council, to which Ronnie Greville replied that he would be shot before he would permit his father or the Council to hoist such a disloyal emblem over the court house of Westmeath as long as he was high sheriff of the county. At the first meeting of the Council after this declaration of war the late Lord Greville attempted to raise the flag, but found a large body of police and Irish constabulary assembled by the captain to prevent it. A hand-to-hand fight ensued, the late Lord Greville, the county Council and the public on one side, and Ronnie Greville, the police and the constabulary on the other, the police using their clubs (or batons, as they are called there), while Lord Greville's followers naturally availed themselves of the shilalahs, brickbats, stones and everything else that came handy. Many heads were broken, and although no one was killed, a good deal of damage was done. At the height of the struggle Lord Greville rescued the flag from the police, made a desperate charge up the stairs of the court house, and flew it from the window, to the cheers of the crowd below. His triumph was, however, short-lived; for almost immediately afterwards the flag was recaptured by the police, and the victory of what has ever since been known as the battle of Mullingar, remained with the high sheriff.

Mrs. Ronnie Greville, who has visited New York since becoming a widow, and who, with her husband, were among the most intimate friends and frequent hosts of the late King Edward, is the daughter and heiress of the multi-millionaire, the Right Hon. William McEwan, and receives an allowance from him of some $150,000, which is destined at his death to be increased to at least $1,000,000 per annum.

The present Lord Greville has two sisters. One of them divorced two years ago Lord Kinnoull's brother, Alestair Hay, and the other is married to Herbert Creer, with whom she lives at Sydney, in New South Wales.

There is no truth in the story that George Morrison, now on leave of absence in England, is to take over the direction of the foreign policy and affairs of the London Times from the present occupant of that post, namely, Valentine Chirol, who formerly belonged to the foreign office. Dr. Morrison is merely in London on his periodical leave, on the conclusion of which he will return to his post as representative of the London Times at Pekin, where he can now be spared less than ever, in view of the extraordinary importance which Chinese affairs have assumed during the last year.

Those who met with him when he was here to attend the Peace Congress, at Portsmouth, five years ago, will admit that he is an extraordinary man. An Austrian by birth, he walked right across that huge continent, commanded an exploring expedition in New Guinea, coming away with two spear heads in his body, took his medical degree at Edinburgh, went through a post-graduate course under Charcot, in Paris, acted as court physician to the Shereef of Wazan, in Morocco, went out from Liverpool to New York as an emigrant, in the steerage, served as an assistant purser in a ship in the West Indian fruit trade, signed as an ordinary seaman before the mast in the South Seas to study the Kanaka question, was one of the heroes of the defense of the legations during the Boxer rebellion, has explored Indo-China; and on the strength of a 3,000 miles trip through China in native dress, at a cost of about $100, and a book written about it, obtained the post of correspondent of the London Times at Pekin, which he has now held for fifteen years.

About Chinese affairs he knows everything in advance, and on many occasions has published revelations in the Times that have shaken the diplomatic chancelleries of the entire Western world. Lord Curzon, when under-secretary for foreign affairs, endeavored to explain the matter away by describing Morrison's statements in the Times as "the intelligent anticipation of events before they occurred"—a remark which led to an expression of regret by the public that the same intelligence apparently could not be infused into British officialdom.

He enjoys the confidence of the Chinese, high and low, to a degree possessed by no other white man, with the possible exception of Sir Robert Hart; and in his typical Chinese house, just outside the legation quarters, at Pekin, he receives letters and visits from people from all parts of the Celestial empire.

Tall, clean shaven, sturdily built, he is a strange mixture of that reticence which invites confidence, and of outspoken and daring frankness. When in London four years ago he was the guest at a dinner given by the China Association, a body largely made up of merchants interested in China trade. There was much characteristic European patronizing and superior talk about China and the Chinese during the dinner, both by notable English and Americans present. Then Morrison arose, and remarked gravely: "There is much to condemn in China. We who know how high are the administrative ideals in this country and in America, who remember how unscathed we emerged from the inquiries into the expenditures during the South African War, naturally condemn administrative methods in China that are not up to our standard. It is natural that we, the most superior of all God's people whose mission it is to pry into the internal affairs of other less favored countries, should condemn procedure in China that would never be tolerated here. It is natural, for example, that the system of purchases of rank in China should be condemned by those nondescript capitalists of alien origin whose admission into our hereditary aristocracy is adding so greatly to its dignity and prestige." Then he went on to state: "Those of us who live among the Chinese are reluctant to leave them. The more we see of them the more we admire their sterling qualities and the more charitably we regard their national idiosyncrasies."

Morrison has just completed a journey through the whole of Central Asia, which enables him to speak with authority concerning the remarkable change that has taken place since the beginning of the year in Far Eastern affairs. Many changes are yet to come, and it is not too much to say that a large portion of the thinking world in this country and in Europe, will take its views about these doings from the line indicated by Dr. Morrison.

(Copyright, 1910, by the Brentwood Company.)

Voice of the People

Communications must not contain more than 300 words.

When this limit is exceeded letters will be returned.

No anonymous communications will be accepted.

A stamped envelope, with the writer's address, must accompany every communication.

The Honor System.

To the Editor of The Times-Dispatch:

Sir,—In your issue of to-day you have an editorial upon the "Honor System in the Schools," and refer its origin to the University of Virginia. This is an injustice to William and Mary College, which practiced the system long before the university was established. Probably the most remarkable administration in the history of the higher education was that of James Madison at William and Mary College from 1777 to 1812. During that time the course was made thoroughly elective, the honor system was practiced to its full extent, no espionage on the action of the students being tolerated, and the professors imparted instruction chiefly by lectures instead of text-books. As early as 1779 the first law school and the first school of modern languages in the United States were established, and not long after the subjects of history and political economy received here the first introduction on this side of the ocean to the lecture room.

The University of Virginia has exercised a great and important influence since the War for Southern Independence, but it must not be forgotten that it came too late on the theatre of action to affect the character and destinies of the brilliant men who made Virginia famous before 1860. Nearly all the college graduates from Virginia up to that year (1860), who held national positions, were William and Mary men. These men reflected in their behavior and action on the great stage of public influence—now practically closed to Virginians, the free, liberal and elevating system of study for which William and Mary was so conspicuous.

The evidence on this subject is overwhelming. (See William and Mary Quarterly, Vol. VI., 176-187; XIV., 71-83; XIX., 117, and Tyler, History of Williamsburg, 176.)

In 1834 Judge Nathaniel Beverley Tucker, professor of law in the college, writing of the system long prevalent at the institution, stated that "the honor of the student is the only witness to which we appeal." This is stating the principle pretty broadly you must admit. LYON G. TYLER.

Williamsburg, September 29.

Make this Bank Your Bank

National State and City Bank

OF RICHMOND, VA.

Capital . . $1,000,000.00
Surplus . . $ 600,000.00

WM. H. PALMER, President.
JOHN S. ELLETT, Vice-President.
WM. M. HILL, Vice-President.
J. W. SINTON, Vice-President.
JULIEN H. HILL, Cashier.

Three per cent. per annum interest allowed on Savings Deposits, compounded every six months.