The Times-Dispatch
DAILY—WEEKLY—SUNDAY.

Business Office.....916 E. Main Street
South Richmond.....1020 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) and Petersburg—

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

Entered January 27, 1905, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

FRIDAY, MARCH 31, 1911.

CAN'T GET OVER IT.

According to the reports that come out of Washington the Commander-in-Chief has satisfied the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs that the military manoeuvres on the Mexican frontier in Texas were admirably arranged for the protection of American lives and American investments in our neighboring Republic. We are told now, and we are glad to know, that after a brief conversation with the President, touching the manoeuvres, Senator Warren, of Wyoming, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and Representative Foster, of Vermont, Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, have been most favorably impressed by the President's course in this matter and will doubtless be able to inform their colleagues in both Houses of Congress as to the "true inwardness" of the President's course.

In the opinion of Senator Warren, "the maintenance of the troops in the field will not cost more than their maintenance in the home quarters," and Congressman Foster believes that the people of the United States will heartily approve all the President has done.

Of course, Senator LaFollette is still to be composed, and we do not suppose that the New York Evening Post will recover for years from the shock it has received by the failure of the President to take the people generally into his confidence when the orders for the mobilization of the army on the Mexican frontier were issued. Fortunately, the Evening Post knew all along exactly why the President had ordered this movement, and it has not been surprised by what he is reported to have said to various members of the Committee during the last few days, but it insists that "it is a pity that Mr. Taft, after giving repeated evidence of a talent for plain speaking that often runs to bluntness, should have failed in just the emergency when plain speaking was necessary." We are further advised by our New York contemporary, whose counsel we always take when it suits us, that "the only condition that could justify Mr. Taft's policy would be if the different provinces in Mexico were not only opposed to Diaz, but were also opposed to each other and to the establishment of a new government in place of the Diaz regime." It must be admitted that there is a great deal of force, propulsive or repulsive, as you please, in what the Evening Post says.

Senator Warren, with whom the President is reported to have talked over the situation, is inclined to believe that no deficiency appropriation will be necessary to meet the expenses of this military demonstration, but, if it should be, we are sure that upon a fair understanding of the conditions the action of the President will be sustained, disappointed newspaper reporters and disgruntled Republican Insurgents to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is to be expected that Senator LaFollette will attack the President about this matter, but, as he would attack the President anyhow about something or other, why not as well about the mobilization of the army as about anything else?

Upon a little reflection the Evening Post will probably conclude that while there are emergencies when plain speaking is necessary, there are also emergencies when silence is imperative. Better that Mr. Taft should have given "his countrymen many hours of intense anxiety"—none of his countrymen in these parts has experienced the least anxiety on account of anything he has done in this matter—it would have been a greater pity had the President unbosomed himself not to his countrymen, but to the correspondents at Washington.

VOTING BY ELECTRICITY.

Assemblyman Thomas Mahon, of the Wisconsin Legislature, is something of a genius. He is a cripple, always having to rely on crutches or a wheel chair. He made his way through the University of Wisconsin by selling pennants and, like all other Wisconsin University men, is strong for La Follette, who is the friend of higher education in that State.

Mahon has introduced a bill in the Assembly, which, if passed and followed by a similar enactment in the Virginia Legislature, would make the official careers of Clarke Williams, of the House, and Clerk Booker, of the Senate, one sweet dream of peace and signified ease. Mahon's idea is to install an electric button system, which will enable the calling of a roll of 100 names and the announcing of the vote in less than a minute, a saving of almost fifteen minutes on every roll call. The device would necessitate the installation of two electric buttons, on the desk of each member. One he would press to vote "aye" and the other to vote "no." By means of a machine on the chief clerk's desk the individual vote of each member would be recorded and finally the results would be tabulated, all by electricity, and all that the clerk would have to do would be to state the vote.

Of course, point upon point of law would be raised against such a time and labor-saving contrivance, but let us hope that Mahon's plan will be given a trial. Our legislators do not talk enough these days; they pass entirely too many wise and beneficial laws, and anything that will make for longer time for them to exercise their right to wallow in the English language should be adopted at once.

FROM RICHMOND TO THE SEA.

A progressive city like Richmond, with excellent railway transportation facilities, possesses advantages over a city with poor railway facilities. A city having good transportation facilities by both land and water is in position to attract large enterprises that could not be attracted if either the one or the other of these means of communication were lacking. These propositions are commonplace, and will not be denied by any one.

Richmond has both water and railway lines, but neither has been developed to its full capacity or anything like its full capacity. There is the projected railway to the Northern Neck, a territory containing more than a thousand square miles of the most fertile country in Virginia and seventy thousand people, the most of whom are native Virginians, practically as far away from Richmond as if the Northern Neck were a thousand miles distant from us, and yet we have been working for weeks and months to impress the progressive and enterprising people of this town with the importance of adding this territory and its people to the trading district of Richmond. There is the James River, which affords Richmond the opportunity for water commerce with the world, an opportunity possessed by few other towns in this country, and the River runs by to the sea without anything like easy and needed improvement. Why not make the most of it? Why not straighten out its curves? Why not keep it from doubling back on itself in its course? It can be done, but it will cost money to do it.

The cut at Dutch Gap has greatly facilitated commerce and materially reduced the danger and loss of freshets at Richmond by affording the water an easier outlet to the sea than there was before Dutch Gap was opened. There are two other curves in the River that ought to be treated in the same way. If these two bends were cut out, from ten to twenty miles would be saved in the distance from Richmond to the ocean and the danger of freshets at Richmond would be practically removed forever. In addition, such improvement of the navigation on the James would afford Richmond a reduction of about one dollar the ton on heavy merchandise and corresponding reductions on other classes of freight to and from New England and other Atlantic ports. Not only would there be a natural and certain reduction in the cost of carrying goods, but there would also be a reduction of cost in handling goods. For example, with these twists in the course of the River straightened out one tug could readily haul a string of barges whereas, owing to the sharp bends in the River, it is now difficult for a tug to tow even one barge.

It would be practicable to cut out the bends in the River at a moderate cost to the Government, thus improving our great waterway not only for commercial purposes, in which the Government would share in the way of increased revenues, but also in the improvement of the strategic importance of the River from a military point of view. The cuts could be made easily by pump dredges as the material to be removed consists largely, if not altogether, of sand and mud, which thrown upon the low and swamp lands along the River would raise them above the freshet line, and render them open to settlement and cultivation.

The railroads at Richmond would not object to such improvement of the James River as we have suggested; that is to say, the railroads at New York, Boston, Philadelphia and at other large commercial cities do not object to water competition, it being recognized that the larger the volume of freights carried by the water lines to a community the greater the benefits to the railroads serving such community. The State of New York has appropriated and is expending one hundred million dollars for the improvement of the canal system in that State now paralleled by four railroad lines or more.

Richmond is not doing the most or the best with the natural advantage it has in the James River. If the James River were at Atlanta what a time the enterprising people of that town would have in making it really "the biggest thing in the State of Georgy!"

GOOD FOR KOHLSAAT.

H. H. Kohlsaat, publisher of the Chicago-Record Herald, told the State Senate Investigating Committee at Springfield on Wednesday that he knew $100,000 had been used to procure the election of William Lorimer to the United States Senate from Illinois; but he declined to answer any of the questions asked by his inquisitors as to the source of his information. When he was asked by Senator Burton: "Would you denounce any citizen who takes the stand you have taken here?" Mr. Kohlsaat made this answer, which entitles him to the respect of the whole newspaper world:

"Any man who will violate a confidence is not worth a snap. I would not let my court reporter violate a confidence. No newspaper man can violate a confidence. That is my code of morals."

There is something very fine about that, something that ought to make the public think better of the newspapers of the better and more responsible sort, and if Mr. Kohlsaat shall be sent to jail by the Investigating Committee for contempt, he will at least have preserved his own sense of honor, and will go there with the respect of all his fellow-workers in a great field.

We have another case in mind of a newspaper correspondent who interviewed some years ago the surviving principal in a duel, the last fatal duel, we believe, fought in a Southern State. An effort was made to use him as a witness for the prosecution of the duellist when he was put on trial for murder, and he refused to be used in this way because the statements made to him by the surviving principal were made to him in the prosecution of his work as a newspaper reporter, and not as a witness against the man who had made certain confidential statements to him. The editor and responsible head of his paper, when the sheriff appeared with a bench warrant for the reporter's arrest, took the very high ground that not only would he decline to order the reporter to do the service asked of him, but, if necessary, he would send him across the ocean rather than that he should violate any of the confidences placed in him in the pursuit of his mission. Mr. Kohlsaat is entirely right: "No newspaper man can violate a confidence." It has been done, to be sure, but not by men who were worthy of their calling.

LINING UP FOR 1912.

The Colonel having gone to that political bourn from which no candidates return, Senator Jonathan Bourne, of Oregon, and President of the Progressive Republican League, has declared it to be his opinion that the next Presidential race will be between Woodrow Wilson, of New Jersey, and Robert M. LaFollette, of Wisconsin, or Theodore Roosevelt, of Martin Littleton's District. Jonathan admitted, however, that the Colonel is on trial, and that "if he came forward with concrete remedies for the ills of the country he might capture the Republican nomination for President."

"Came forward?" Why, he has "came forward" for days and weeks and months and weary years with more concrete remedies than anybody that was ever known in the history of politics in this country. "Concrete remedies" are his principal stock in trade. They have not all been new or original, and few of them have been lawful or practical; but they have been "concrete" of the concretest sort, besides which the concrete of the Appian Way would be but as slush.

When he was asked why Taft should not be the next nominee of the Republicans, the Senator from Oregon said: "Because President Taft in none of his public utterances or actions has shown favor for the fundamentals of popular Government. The only thing that could be construed that way was in his letter of acceptance, when he said he favored the election of Senators by direct vote." We had forgotten that Taft said anything like that; but, if he did, we think none the more of him for it, because that would be really striking at the root of popular government as it was framed by the people of the country at the foundation of the Government, and has been the hope and stay of the people since the Constitution was established.

It is gratifying, however, that Senator Bourne has spoken so plainly, saying that we would prefer that he should not have tried to put the double cross on Woodrow Wilson, any man upon whom Jonathan sets the seal of his approval being made by that very act liable to suspicion. It will be easy sailing, however, for the Democrats in the contest if Wilson shall be stacked up against the Colonel or Senator LaFollette, and with Taft out of the way the result would not be doubtful.

"THE F STREET HABIT."

In the time of DuMaurier, it was the French Quarter in Paris and "The Merry Widow" was cast at Maxim's. In New York, it used to be Rector's. In nearly all the other considerable capitals of the world there is some place or other where the wicked and "devilish sly" are accustomed to assemble. They have a rather sorry time after all, in spite of much advertising, but it is regarded now as quite the proper caper for sight-seers to know exactly what particular locality in each city is noted for its abandon.

On Wednesday, the Rev. Mr. Wilfrey, Pastor of the Vermont Avenue Christian Church, in Washington, criticised with much severity "the painted and vulgar young women and the profligate young men who promenade F Street every afternoon." "The F Street habit," the minister declared, is a "disgrace to Washington, and one of the greatest dangers that confront the young folks in the Capital City." The police are unable to cope with it, and parents are admonished that their children should not be allowed to take part in this daily promenade on F Street. We are told that "every afternoon between the hours of 4 and 6 o'clock hundreds of young women and profligate young men swarm up and down F Street, carrying on brazen flirtations"; that many of the promenaders appear to be from respectable families, but they are fast losing every thread of decency they ever boasted"; "you may walk F Street any afternoon and see these painted beauties and young male freaks making eyes at one another in a most disgraceful manner." This is awfully bad, and those of us who do not wish to be led into temptation, but who have been travelling F Street for a good many years and at a good many hours of the day and night without being attracted by the disgraceful scenes now to be witnessed on that prominent street of the National Capital, will be compelled hereafter, we suppose, to stay down on Pennsylvania Avenue, where there is room enough to pass without coming in contact with the "painted beauties and the young male freaks."

As soon as the word gets around the country, however, that F Street is the place to see the sights it would be a precautionary measure, at least, if Major Sylvester, Chief of Police, should strengthen the guard all along that gilded way. When Mayor Gaynor was over in Washington some months ago he was reported to have said upon his return to his home in New York that he had seen things in Washington which would put the blush to Gotham. We wonder if he could have been knocking around on F Street at any time between the hours of 4 and 6 o'clock in the afternoon?

Isn't it queer how one can almost always find in any town or community exactly what he is looking for? We do not think the people of Washington are angels by any means, but we do not believe that there is a display of vice, either positive or potential, on any of the streets in Washington or in any other well ordered American city. Besides, nobody nowadays likes "painted beauties," and "male freaks" have no standing at all in any sort of society any more; but the place is known now and the hours, and Major Sylvester will have lost something of his cunning if he do not see that the force is materially strengthened on F Street hereafter.

NO PROHIBITION DESIRED.

Those who know the facts about the relative standing of the States of this Union will agree that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is one of the first four States in rank. It is a great State—progressive, wealthy, taking giant strides in legislation looking to the welfare and uplift of the average man. Its laws and its courts are unexcelled. The Old Bay State looks on government as a science and not as a political plaything and has long since done away with the fanatic and the firebrand.

Of deep significance, therefore, is the news of the recent action of the Massachusetts House of Representatives as to prohibition. As all agree, the House is immediately responsive to the will of the people and expresses popular sentiment. Several days ago an adverse report was made to the House on a petition for absolute prohibition in the State. Without even a division vote, this report was immediately accepted by the House and this action serves notice on everyone that Massachusetts is satisfied with her liquor laws.

The Boston Globe says:

"This State has tried prohibition in years gone by and found it wholly unsatisfactory. Since then the Massachusetts liquor laws, all resting on local option, have been developed. At the present time, therefore, when other States are full of agitation over prohibition, our Legislature, understanding the public sentiment on the subject does not have to take even a vote on a prohibitory measure."

This policy of letting well enough alone, as our contemporary says, is right. The citizens of Massachusetts are satisfied with their liquor legislation and "it is a waste of time for any one to endeavor to get the State again to bring on itself the trouble inseparable from prohibitory laws."

JUST LIKE OTHER BOYS.

"Young Patrick was a thorough idler, and it is said of him that he loved idleness for its own sake."

Such is a sentence in a sketch of Patrick Henry, lately printed by the Boston Globe, which ought to know better. Patrick Henry was just like other boys of his day and time, no more industrious, no more idle, though possessed of a finer mind than most of his fellows. This indictment against Henry as a youth seems to have been vitalized by William Wirt in his life of the great Virginia patriot. Apparently, Wirt, in writing his book, deliberately failed to take into account the estimate of Henry, as a lad, written by Colonel Samuel Meredith, who lived but four miles from Henry, and married his sister. The Meredith narrative distinctly creates the impression that Patrick was just an ordinary boy, fond of fishing and hunting. In his picture of young Henry, Wirt "seems to have yielded to an impulse to romance." Weem's life of Washington had been much laughed at in Wirt's time, because the book almost deified Washington as a youth, and Wirt may have been unwilling to risk anything by denying that Henry was indolent.

The whole matter is threshed out by George Morgan in his admirable book, "The True Patrick Henry," in which he adduces considerable evidence to show that the boy Henry was no more indolent than the average lad. Morgan very strikingly says in his defence of Henry:

"One of his boyhood joys was to sit in a shady place and watch the cork on his fishing line. Or, flat on his back, with his hands clasped under his head and his legs crossed in air, he would watch the buzzards in their gyrations a full mile aloft. Considering the native wholesomeness and acuteness of his mind, he was probably learning more than he could have gathered from all the Jarratts in the colony. For who shall say that he was not more studious while thus prone upon his back than if he had been bench-fast in a schoolroom thumbing a dull book? His eyes were sharp; his memory was keen; his whole mind plastic, receptive, retentive. Like John in the wilderness, he saw and absorbed. Repent! thought John, again and again. What our Patrick thought is best shown in what he said and did when it came his turn to do and say. . . . . This schooling must have made of him something truer, something saner, something freer and stronger than he would have been if he had leaned unduly upon what mankind puts into books."

In other words, Patrick Henry, in his boyhood, was just like thousands of others of his age then and now—not over fond of work, when it is a fine day and pleasant out of doors, with a river full of fish nearby and good shooting in the pine thickets. Patrick did not like to study at school, perhaps, but rare is the boy who really does like to study then. At fifteen a boy does not look on work as a blessing or a delight. Patrick Henry as a lad was normal—no more, no less.

FOR SIMPLICITY.

Chief Justice White, of the United States Supreme Court believes in Jeffersonian simplicity. He has ordered that when the judges of the highest court in the world are announced as they file in the Supreme Court chamber in Washington, the form of the announcement shall be simply "The Supreme Court of the United States." The old salutation was "The honorable, the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States."

In some State courts the entrance of the judges is announced thus: "Court!" In others, the court is unannounced. The simple and severe dignity of the new announcement throws a small but interesting sidelight upon the character of the new Chief Justice.

If there were as little "back" in the ordinary gowns of the ladies as Miss Mary Garden appears to have in her dresses, as shown by her photographs to be seen in so many of the store windows in town, there would not be nearly so much trouble in buttoning them up.

Daniel C. Smith is reported to have said that he did not have any appointment to meet Booker Washington in New York. All that Booker said was that he had heard that Mr. Smith, who is the auditor of Tuskegee Institute, would be in New York about the time he was there, and that he only went out to hunt him. He did not find him, but ran across Ulrich with somewhat embarrassing consequences, as the whole country knows. We cannot urge Booker too strongly to give up his visits to New York and to stay down home among his own white people. It is pleasant, of course, for him to have the unabated confidence of Seth Low and to have received a kind letter from the President; but he is never so safe as when he is down among real white folks in Alabama.

In its "Events of March 28," the Baltimore Star makes the mistake of saying that General Wade Hampton, of the Confederate States Army, was "born in Columbia, S. D., in 1818." General Wade Hampton was never in South Dakota in his life, so far as we know, and he was not born in Columbia, S. D., but in Charleston, S. C., in Hasell Street, and the house in which he was born is still standing and ought to be preserved as one of the landmarks of that town.

The Orange Observer confesses that it wouldn't mind "if some one would hook our dress up the back when we get ready for church on Sunday." This is the most damaging evidence against equal suffrage that we have yet seen.

Now that the season of "snaps" is approaching, we wish that some sort of working agreement could be reached with the cooks by which they would undertake to "string" the beans before preparing them for the table. The "strings" are really not good to eat and are awfully hard on the digestion.

The mint crop in West Franklin Street is coming along in fine condition and was never so minty. The rank grass of Kentucky is not to be compared with this unapproachable product of grand Old Virginia, and it is an insult to speak of the Texan variety of mesquite in the same column.

The latest species of man is "the seidlitz-powder man," who infests banquets and is described thus, "a man who has an opinion on everything; who is everlastingly funny, or thinks he is, generally the latter; who is always telling you what 'my wife and I' did; what he is going to do to-morrow night; who has been in every place that is mentioned or has friends there; who tells such long stories that you miss your car; who is a seidlitz powder—only a seidlitz powder gets through effervescing some time." In other words, he is a brother to the bromidiot.

An explanation of the O'Keefe trousers tragedy in New York and Philadelphia has been suggested by a lady to the effect that Mrs. O'Keefe had simply kept the trousers to mend them, not to deprive her spouse of their use. It was Mr. O'Keefe's misfortune, of course, that he did not have but one pair, and the explanation is generous, if not exact, to say the least.

In Shafer Street early yesterday morning, there was a noise like paving the roadway, but lo! it was only a band of earnest workmen engaged in repairing a hydrant. Senator Grundy has not yet succeeded in making the improvement of this great thoroughfare he has so much at heart, but things will come to pass even in Shafer Street, Richmond, some sweet day.

Governor Foss, of Massachusetts, believes in letting old wounds heal. He has vetoed a bill appropriating $3,500 to assist the city of Lowell in celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the departure of the Sixth Regiment for the field in '61. One of his reasons was "no helpful service to the people of this Commonwealth or nation can be rendered by this commemoration of bloodshed in battle between the opposing sections of the country." He is right about it, and, as every Massachusetts Democrat must have, he has the courage of his convictions.

Harris Anti-Dyspeptic Water
"Begets Health"
Nature's best remedy for dyspepsia, indigestion and kidney troubles. Try it for a week then—
"Tell your friends"
Sold by all druggists—just as it flows from the spring.
J. A. MORRIS & CO., Distributors
211 North 6th St. Richmond, Va.

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.

The Monroe Doctrine.

Please print the definition of the Monroe Doctrine, or the whole doctrine.
ARTHUR TUCK.

The Monroe Doctrine is frequently invoked and appealed to in connection with the troubles of the American republics to the south of us and our relations to them. At the time it was enunciated the United States had not long emerged from its two wars with England and established a government of sufficient stability and permanency to take a self-assertive stand on our rights and dignity as a nation. It was in his annual message to Congress of December 2, 1823, that President Monroe said:

"The occasion has been judged proper for asserting as a principle, in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power."

President Mohroe further said in enunciating his famous doctrine:

"In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are involved, or seriously menaced, that we resent injuries, or make preparations for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere, we are, of necessity, more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the Allied Powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments; and to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of our most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity.

"We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those European powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extent their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety.

"With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

The whole intent and purpose of this doctrine clearly was to preserve the independence of the Latin-American countries.

Artists' Addresses.

Please give me the addresses of the following artists:

Ernest Fosbery, Balfour Ker, James Montgomery Flagg, Herman Pfeifer, Harrison Fisher, C. Allan Gilbert, F. Earl Christy, Malcolm Strauss, William T. Van Dresser, A. B. Wenzell.
ANXIOUS.

Flagg, 33 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York; Fisher, 7 West Thirty-second Street, New York; Gilbert, 17 West Thirty-seventh Street, New York; Wenzell, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, or 40 West End Avenue, New York. The others may be addressed in care of the publication in which their work appears, or the publishers of books they have illustrated.

Meaning of "Laborer."

Would you call a cashier in a bank a laborer? Tell me what the word laborer means? A READER.

In a specific sense, a cashier is not a laborer. A laborer is "one who is engaged in some toilsome physical occupation—an unskilled workman engaged in labor other than that of a domestic servant, particularly in husbandry."

DID NOT SQUANDER FORTUNE OF SISTER

BY LA MARQUISE DE FONTENOY.

KING LEOPOLD'S memory is burdened with so many unsavory memories, and his name has been the subject of so many accusations of one sort and another, that it is only fair to relieve him of one charge which has hitherto rested upon his head, and which during his lifetime received the widest sort of circulation. It is the charge that he had squandered the large fortune of his sister, the ex-Empress Charlotte of Mexico, of which he had arbitrarily appointed himself trustee and custodian.

Indeed, it was even alleged that if he prevented any of her English, French or Austrian relatives from visiting her, it was because he dreaded that they would discover that she was no longer insane, and that he was merely keeping her in captivity as a lunatic, to prevent her from demanding from him an accounting of her money, which he had squandered in speculation. He himself contributed in no small degree to this belief, by his extraordinary attitude towards the Austrian imperial family, to the members of which he declined to give the slightest information about the ex-Empress's affairs, although she was an Austrian archduchess by marriage, and a sister-in-law of Emperor Francis Joseph.

After Leopold's death, King Albert gave directions for a careful and through investigation into all matters relating to the property of his unfortunate aunt, who has never recovered her reason since she became bereft thereof during an extraordinary interview with Pope Pius IX., at the Vatican in 1867. This investigation, carried on by dignitaries of the government, in connection with Baron Goffinet, one of the most trusted confidants of Leopold, and chief executor of his testamentary dispositions, shows that her fortune is not only intact, but has been carefully administered, so that to-day it amounts to almost $20,000,000. As both she and her husband, Emperor Maximilian, had sacrificed all their tangible resources in their unfortunate Mexican adventure, and as it was only the remnant of the property bequeathed to Charlotte by her father, that had remained in the hands of Leopold at the time when she became insane, it must be admitted that he did his duty by her.

Her health within the last two months has become very bad. In fact, it looks as if her end were approaching, and when she dies, this great fortune of hers will be divided up among six heirs, namely, her nieces, Louise of Belgium, divorced wife of Prince Philip of Coburg, ex-Crownprincess Stephanie, and Princess Clementine, now the wife of Prince Victor Napoleon; King Albert of Belgium, and his two sisters, one of them the wife of the French Orleans prince, known as the Duke of Vendome; and the other married to Prince Charles of Hohenzollern.

Very lame indeed is the explanation put forward for the failure of Queen Mary to invite the Duchess of Marlborough to be one of her canopy-bearers on the occasion of her coronation. It is alleged that if she has been left out in the cold by the Queen, it is owing to the fact that she is not of noble blood, and does not belong by birth to the peerage. But of the quartet of duchesses selected by Queen Mary for the purpose, (three of whom, namely, the Duchesses of Portland, Sutherland and Montrose, acted, together with the Duchess of Marlborough, as canopy-bearers at the coronation of Queen Alexandra nine years ago,) only one can strictly be described as belonging by birth to the peerage, namely, the Duchess of Sutherland, who is the daughter of a peer, namely, the late Earl of Rosslyn. The Duchess of Portland is the daughter of a commoner, namely, of Thomas Dallas Yorke. The Duchess of Hamilton and of Brandon was a Miss Nina Poore, daughter of Major Robert Poore, also a commoner; while the Duchess of Montrose is the daughter of a baronet, that is to say, of Sir Frederick Graham, of Netherby, who is a commoner. For baronets and their families are not considered as belonging to the peerage.

Nor is it due to any prejudice against Americans, that Queen Mary has refrained from asking the Duchess of Marlborough to act as her canopy-bearer. For the Queen has many intimate American friends, chief and foremost among them the Duchess of Roxburghe, who was Miss May Goelet, of New York, and Lady Carington, who was Miss Frances Warden, of New York, and whose husband has been the most important member of Queen Mary's household, ever since her marriage. The only reason why the Duchess of Marlborough has never been invited to serve, is because of her separation from her husband, to which must likewise be ascribed her absence from all great court functions. Indeed, it is doubtful under the circumstances, and in view of the strict rules that prevailed during the Victorian reign, and that have been revived by King George and Queen Mary, whether the duchess will receive her summons, as a peeress of the realm, to the coronation.

The London newspapers made a stupid mistake, which they were compelled to retract, in ascribing to the Hon. Arthur Ernest Guinness, second son of Viscount Iveagh, the bankruptcy of his cousin, Algernon Arthur Lee Guinness, who has just been declared insolvent, with $500,000 of liabilities. The bankrupt is the eldest son of the late Captain Benjamin Guinness, of the Royal Horse Guards, and of Lady Elizabeth Guinness, daughter of the late Earl of Howth. He is a nephew of Lord Iveagh, and of Lord Ardilaun, and next heir to the latter's baronetcy, but not to his peerage. The baronetcy was originally bestowed upon his grandfather, the Benjamin Lee Guinness, of brewing fame, who at his own cost restored the Cathedral of St. Patrick's, in Dublin.

Duke John Albert of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, who until he accepted the regency of the sovereign duchy of Brunswick, was the very active president of the Colonial Society of the German Empire, and who is one of the most progressive and traveled of Teuton rulers, having recently returned with his wife from a prolonged visit to the near and far Orient, delivered himself of a most striking speech at the annual banquet of the great shipping interests at Bremen the other day. And if I call attention to it, it is because the remarks of this prince, who speaks with the knowledge of an expert, are in diametrical contradiction of the assertions from other sources to the effect that German trade and industry are driving all others out of the field, in foreign, and especially in Oriental markets. He says:

"We see German commerce yielding ground step by step, and many an anxious German eye looks up at the lofty mast, with the question 'When will the black, white and red ensign (the German flag) be hauled down, and give place to the Union Jack, the tricolor, the Stars and Stripes, or even to the Yellow Dragon banner?' That is a grave saying. Yet I think it should be uttered here, by some one who has a warm heart for German trade and German shipping, and the cry should go up before it is too late, 'All hands on deck!'"

The speech of the duke, who urged that "German shipping, industrial and commercial interests should unite in the furtherance of the welfare of the empire abroad, instead of a wild fight of all against all, and a division of German interests," has attracted a great sensation throughout Germany, and is used as an argument to show that, in the first place, Teuton commerce in the Orient is not as successful as has been claimed by the Kaiser's government, and secondly, that the official backing and support which it has received to such an extensive degree, has tended to stultify and impair, rather than to develop the growth of Teuton trade abroad.

(Copyright, 1911, by the Brentwood Company.)

Make this Bank Your Bank
National State and City Bank
OF RICHMOND