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	.61
Daily without Sunday.....	4.00	2.00	1.00	.34
Sunday edition only.....	2.00	1.00	.50	.17
Weekly (Wednesday).....	1.00	.50	.25	.—

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

	One Week
Daily with Sunday.....	15 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.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1911.

THE CANADIAN CALAMITY.

"Canada needs our markets more than we need hers," says the New York Herald. "The time will come, we think, when intelligent Canadian opinion will regard yesterday's election as one of the greatest disasters that has ever befallen the Dominion," says the New York World. "The Canadian election is a triumph of reaction and ignorance," says the New York Times. "The Canadian voters have evidently been governed more by prejudice than by reason in rejecting a friendly trade agreement by which both Canada and the United States would undoubtedly have profited," says the New York Tribune.

Chairman Underwood, Democratic leader in the House, through whose faithful and superb work the reciprocity resolutions were passed by the well-nigh unanimous vote of the Democrats in Congress, said when he heard of the result of the election in Canada: "I am greatly surprised and disappointed. . . . I believe that reciprocity would have resulted in good to both countries concerned, and that both countries, as a result of to-day's election, have suffered material losses." President Taft was stunned when he heard the result of the election, and, when he had recovered the power of speech, said: "For me it is a great disappointment. . . It takes two to make a bargain, and if Canada declines, we can go on doing business at the old stand."

All this seems to cover the situation as well as it can be covered at this time. The reciprocity measure was Mr. Taft's own particular affair; but it was at the same time a Democratic policy and could not have prevailed without Democratic support—the only people in this country who can be pleased with its defeat are the Insurgent Republican members of Congress who opposed it for political reasons of a low-down sort and the "business interests" which were unwilling to let any of their profits go even for the sake of adopting a larger commercial policy which would in the end have paid them better than the narrow and selfish lines on which they are willing to move.

We do not share in the optimistic view of The Herald, which was, in fact, behind the reciprocity movement long before any of the other newspaper claimants for this honor knew what reciprocity really meant, that "Canada needs our markets more than we need hers;" nor do we think with Mr. Taft that "we can go on doing business at the old stand." We had far more to gain by this movement than Canada, and Canada can live without us as well as we can live without her, or better. The Canadian Dominion is larger than the United States in extent of territory—the area of the former being 3,729,665 square miles and the area of the United States, proper, being 3,026,789 square miles. The population of the Dominion is less really than the population of the State of New York; but its material development in the last few years has been altogether phenomenal. In 1910, the value of the imports from Canada to the United States was $95,128,310, and the value of the exports from the United States to Canada was $215,990,021. The balance of trade was largely in our favor, and the adoption of the reciprocity measure, the Canadians doubtless thought, would have made the balance against them even greater.

We hoped for Canadian agreement with us in this effort to bring about closer trade relations and go a long way toward breaking down the high protection tariff wall, which, while guarding the selfish interests of special classes of our manufacturers, has shut us out of the markets of the world. Of one thing we may be sure. Canada can get along without us, and if she shall draw the lines tighter against us, as some person fatally bent upon mischief has suggested, we shall have an object lesson of the greatest value as to the demerits of the Protective system when practically applied to us and our affairs. For purely educational purposes, we trust that Premier Borden will build the tariff wall a little bit higher all along the border. "The home market" is a great thing, of course, and we can hold on to that, but if all the commercial countries would adopt the American system we should find instantly what a wicked system it is, to be sure.

GARBAGE CARTS IN RICHMOND.

"Garbage carted about the city in unsightly wagons, as at present, teeming with flies and other insects, is very repulsive, and to add to this the nauseating sight of the wagons with side or end lids raised is exceedingly disgusting, and, furthermore, is entirely unnecessary.

That was written by a correspondent of the New Haven Journal-Courier; but it might have been written as well by a correspondent of The Times-Dispatch and of the conditions in this town. At 10 o'clock yesterday morning an open City cart, to which one mule was hitched, was going through Shafer Street loaded with garbage. Frequently during the last summer carts loaded with garbage, and swarming with flies, and "smelling to heaven" passed through Franklin Street without anybody to molest them or make them afraid of the statutes and ordinances and regulations forbidding the carriage of garbage through the streets except in covered receptacles. It does not look well, it does not promote the public health, it ought not to be possible in a city like this.

New Haven is a fine town, the seat of a great University, the home of the liberal arts; but New Haven has no advantage over Richmond when it comes to the garbage question.

WHAT THE PRIMARY COSTS.

At the recent primary election in Maryland, there were two Democratic candidates for Governor, Senator Gorman and Senator Lee. The contest between them was very actively waged, and at times approached a degree of bitterness which was not conducive to party success or of such educational value as the primary system was designed to secure. How much the campaign cost in dollars and cents has not yet been ascertained; but the Baltimore American says: "Senator Lee admits that he spent about $25,000 in the primary campaign, and Senator Gorman that he spent about $7,500. Of course, these amounts do not begin to cover the real outlay of that hot fight for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination—a careful student of local politics places the figures as far beyond $100,000. This raises the practical question," says The American, "whether a primary law which requires and even permits such an outlay and bars from candidacy all but rich men is a law to be desired. Sober consideration of the question will doubtless result in the conclusion that many changes will have to be made in the law before it can be called truly democratic."

Twenty-five thousand dollars are a good many dollars for any man to pay for any office, and then to pay and lose! The Governor of Maryland holds office four years and is paid the annual salary of $4,500. Even if he had been nominated and elected Governor, Senator Lee—not counting what it would cost him to live and support his family—would have received in the way of salary from the State $7,000 less than the money paid by him for the nomination. There is something wrong about any system which would make such a condition as this possible. That the primary system of nominating candidates for office fosters and encourages the expenditure of immense sums of money, that it keeps the voters of the party adopting this method in an almost constant state of excitement, that it makes "more politics," that it does not improve the quality of the candidates, can be established, we think, by a cloud of witnesses from all the States in which the system has been adopted and been in practical operation. It is a good system, however, for at least two classes of men who aspire to public station—the rich and the corrupt; the rich who are willing to pay for the honor of holding high office and the corrupt who are always ready to use money for the accomplishment of their objects. It gives both these classes undoubtedly a great advantage; but it effectually blocks the way of the representatives of the plain people, in whose interest the system was ostensibly invented, whatever their character or attainments or good faith or ability to serve.

In Alabama, where the system has been longest in operation, some of its strongest advocates, notably the Montgomery Advertiser, have admitted that it has not accomplished the purposes for which they thought it was admirably designed. In Virginia, there are also many who thought that the system would purify and elevate politics and who now confess their disappointment at the practical working of the system. In some of the counties steps have been taken looking to its abolition or at least to its amendment, so that it may be patched up, if possible, into a dependable method for the selection of candidates. There is too much machinery in our politics, the people are wearied to death by frequent elections, good men and true, who cannot spare from their small store the money needed to enter politics, are compelled to stay out, and many of the strongest and best men shun public service because the exactions are too great.

OUR DISAPPEARING GAME.

At the time of its discovery and for several centuries afterward, this continent was a vast game preserve. The Indians lived on this game without reducing its quantity, and a great number of the early settlers were famous hunters. The shooting of game has continued to be a sport and a business, until now birds and animals are disappearing.

"Will You Have a Gameless Continent?" is the title of a warning article lately published by W. T. Hornday, Director of the New York Zoological Park, in which he shows that we now have not more than one bird and one quadruped for every ninety-nine that we had forty years ago. Confirming this sincere warning, Theodore D. Eason, of Oklahoma, contributes an excellent paper to the current "Popular Science Monthly" on "The Narrowing Circle of the Animal Kingdom."

Mr. Eason directs attention to the fact that while in the older regions of the country the scarcity of animals and birds has been observed for a long period, people are now asking in the timbered region of the West: "What has become of our Rocky Mountain goats and sheep?" "Where are the elk and other deer?" In Maine, the moose and caribou have disappeared. The buffalo, which once wandered from Carolina to the foothills of the Rockies in herds calculated to have contained from one hundred and fifty million to four hundred and fifty million, and which, in 1850, by a Government census, numbered forty million head, are now reduced to 2,108, as shown by a recent census of "The American Bison Society."

Almost all of the larger animals which used to be found in vast numbers throughout what is now the United States are practically extinct. Bird life has been diminished even more than animal life, and with more harmful results, since insect life has increased in proportion, with very destructive consequences. The bringing of wild land into cultivation would naturally be attended by a reduction of wild animal life, but reckless, continuous shooting simply for the sake of killing is the chief cause of this deplorable slaughter of the animal life of the continent. Several States, by legislation, are trying to protect the remnant of the game still left, and Audubon Societies are seeking earnestly to enlist public opinion and legislation against the destruction of birds. It is to be hoped that by these and other means the small quantity of game left us may not be exterminated and that the narrowing circle of the animal kingdom may not be brought down to zero.

LAW IN CONNECTICUT.

It required about fourteen columns, set in small type, in the Hartford Courant two days ago to hold the titles of the bills passed by the Connecticut Legislature at its recent session; not the text of the acts, but only their titles expressed in the fewest possible words. If the text of the laws had been printed, and the paper been cut into column widths the strip would easily have reached from the Connecticut to the James and back again. Of the making of laws there is no end. There is too much legislation. There is too much government.

THE SPEAKER ON PISGAH.

The next time Champ Clark goes up on top of Mount Pisgah (pronounced "Pizgy" in Missouri and Texas) it is hoped that he will inform the country if he discover anything that looks like the United States flag in any of the British Possessions in the direction of the North Pole.

A GOOD ROADS LESSON.

New England farmers generally have become firm believers in good roads, says the Boston Globe, but if there remain any yet unconverted, their attention is called to the tale of a farmer in Wisconsin, told by the State Geologist.

The man had a thousand bushels of potatoes in the cellar, which he was holding for good prices. An offer of 92 cents came in March, but, as he said, the roads were so bad that the only way he could get to town was by telephone. By the time the roads finally dried out he obtained only 30 cents the bushel for his potatoes.

Bad roads cost that farmer more than $600, a sum more than sufficient to have paid his share of the cost had all the main highways of his county been improved.

PIKE.

"One of the great poets of the nineteenth century is comparatively little known or rather little of his poetry is known to the present generation," declares the Birmingham Age-Herald, referring to Albert Pike. He was born in Boston, but he was identified with the South and greatly esteemed in this region. He was a pioneer of Arkansas. From 1833 to 1836 he was associate editor and afterwards proprietor of the Arkansas Advocate. "His name became a household word."

His "Hymns to the Gods" were published first in 1839 in Blackwood's Magazine. A volume of his poems was published in 1854; but it is out of print. Despite the fact that his friends and admirers urged him to prepare a new edition, Pike declined. A few of his poems, including "Every Year," written after he was well advanced in life, go the rounds of the press occasionally, and appear in some of the books of poetical selections. "The Mocking Bird" and "The Lost Isadore," two of his famous poems, written in his early days, can be found in some of the recent libraries of selected literature. The Age-Herald regards "August" as Pike's finest poem, and likewise commends his "Annie."

Pike and Poe were contemporaries. They were not, however, personally known to each other. There is no evidence that Pike had read any of Poe's verse at the time he wrote his "Annie," but this poem is "as musical as anything produced by the author of 'The Raven.'" By the way, Ingram, the English author who wrote a life of Poe, having come across Pike's "Lost Isadore," devotes a whole chapter to show that Poe must have seen this poem before he wrote "The Raven." The two have the same form and rhythm. Weirdness and melancholy pervade both. When "The Hymns of the Gods" were published in Blackwood's, the celebrated British critic, Christopher North, in analyzing them, wrote with unstinted praise, hailing Pike as one of the greatest of poets.

Pike was born in 1809 and died in 1891. He was an ardent Mason from his early years, and in the latter part of his life gave his time exclusively to Masonic affairs and Masonic literature. He was an able and distinguished lawyer, and was in active practice before the war and afterward until 1868. He was in command of a squadron of Arkansas cavalry in Mexico, and won distinction as a fighter. In the Confederate Army he was a brigadier-general, and commanded a detachment of Indians on the field of battle.

A new edition of Pike's poems would have wide reading—in the opinion of the Age-Herald it would "result in Pike's taking permanent rank with Poe, Longfellow, Emerson, Lanier, Whitman and Tabb." Certain it is, that Pike was a poet who does not deserve to be forgotten, for his work was of great merit and art. Like many other brilliant Southern writers, he has been neglected, and his fame obscured by the silence of Northern literary critics who regard all Southern literature as incidental and negligible.

DOMESTIC SCIENCE AND SOCIETY.

Professor John W. Curtis, head of the vocational department of the Memphis public schools, declares that domestic science benefits society. He is right about it.

In 1907 the teachers in thirty-four rural schools in Wright County, Georgia, were requested to ask their pupils if they liked farm life and wished to keep on in it. Of 164 boys, 157 said that they had no desire to be farmers, while 167 girls out of 174 said that they did not wish to stay on the farm. In 1910 the same query was put in the same school, and 162 boys out of 174 answered that they intended to be farmers, while 161 girls out of 178 preferred rural life. During the interim between the first and second queries the teaching of elementary agriculture and home economics had been introduced as a part of the daily class work. This appears to answer the question: "How shall we keep the farmer's children on the farm?"

All of this goes to indicate that work is made pleasant by familiarity, "a conscious knowledge of equipment." In this way society is arriving at necessary solutions of problems. Skill in domestic science or in mechanics or in agriculture makes those fields of labor more attractive. More dignity is given to them.

FIFTY YEARS IN ADVANCE.

"It is only a question of time until commission government shall prevail throughout this country," said Professor Frank S. Hoffman, head of the philosophy department at Union College, New York, to a representative of the Schenectady Union-Star, in a recent interview. Dr. Hoffman has just come back from Europe, where he has been making a careful study of municipal conditions. Just before he left this country three months ago, he was appointed a member of a commission to make recommendations for the revision of the city charter of Schenectady, a place of 72,836 inhabitants by the last census. Dr. Hoffman was designated to visit European cities and make observations, and he, as a result of his investigations, is heartily in favor of some form of commission government for his home city.

Dr. Hoffman began investigating the subject of commission government almost as soon as his steamer left New York, as the Mayor of Christiania, Norway, was on board. For seventeen years this mayor has been in office. Christiania is practically governed by commission. The mayor is nominally appointed by the King. It is a beautiful modern city, of which no adverse criticisms have ever been made.

In Germany, Dr. Hoffman visited Hamburg. In 1897 that city was devastated by the plague. Now many consider it the most sanitary, most progressive and most beautiful city in the world. More than one million people dwell within its gates. More than $30,000 have lately been expended on its harbor. It is chiefly governed by a small body called the senate, the members of which are elected for life by the city council. Dr. Hoffman "found no desire whatever on the part of the citizens to have the method of city government changed."

From Hamburg, Dr. Hoffman went to Copenhagen, and to his surprise found there one of the most attractive and beautiful cities of Europe, with a population larger than that of Boston. This city, too, is managed by a small board of experts.

The next city visited was Berlin, the third largest city in the world, surpassed in population only by London and New York. The present mayor has been in office during a large part of the rapid increase in population. He has two assistants, and in connection with a relatively small city council manages the city affairs. "No whisper of graft or misuse of power came to me from any quarter of the city as I mingled with the people."

Similar experiences were had by the investigator in Dresden, Leipsic, Munich and other large cities in Germany, which have grown tremendously in population, and consequently in difficulty of administration in the last fifteen years. In Germany no man would think of being a candidate for mayor unless he was qualified for the office by a university course and had the intention to make it a lifework like any other profession.

The amount of money handled by some of these cities is enormous. In Leipsic, for instance, there is being built the largest and most expensive railway station in the world. While the state owns the railway a great share of the money goes through the hands of the Leipsic county officers. These officers are appointed for life—consequently none can be approached by corporate interests with the promise of help in future elections.

In Germany only those who pay some taxes have a vote for member of the city council. The people believe that every man, by virtue of being a member of the body politic, has the right to vote on what we call State and National issues, but no right to vote on the expenditure of money for local affairs unless he contribute something toward the expense.

In England, Dr. Hoffman studied the city governments of London, Manchester, Liverpool, Edinburgh and Glasgow; all of these cities are governed by a city council, which chooses a small number of experts to administer the affairs of the city. The mayors are unpaid and perform chiefly a social function. They are usually men who have had long service in the city council and receive this honor as a reward for long and beneficial service.

As a result of his studies and investigation, Dr. Hoffman declared that this country is now passing through the stages of municipal government that Europe faced half a century ago. He is of opinion that the United States must come to the same conclusions that have been reached in Europe—that a small number of paid and permanent officers is the only way to have a stable and efficient government, and that continual changes of administration are demoralizing.

The Chicago Tribune ought to know that Jericho was the name of a place or city, and not the name of a man.

A St. Louis newspaper has a story about the resignation of a Missouri preacher because his salary was too large. His pulpit is now vacant, and applicants should send in their names at once.

Become a Depositor with the National State and City Bank

Your money will be kept in absolute security.

Payment by check provides indisputable receipts in the form of your returned cancelled checks.

We offer the services of a strong, sound bank to the small as well as the large depositor.

National State and City Bank
RICHMOND, VA.

Wm. H. Palmer, President.
John S. Ellett, Vice-President.
Wm. M. Hill, Vice-President.
J. W. Sinton, Vice-President.
Julien H. Hill, Cashier.

Voice of the People

Fairness in the Beattie Trial.

To the Editor of The Times-Dispatch:

Sir,—Having noticed an article in your paper of Sunday, 11th, entitled, "World Convicted the Prisoner First," I feel constrained to express the opinion of one at least who did not join in the mad rush of the community to convict the accused unheard. "World convicted the prisoner first." That is the whole thing in a nutshell. The world convicted the prisoner first, unheard, long before the case was even outlined, long before the grand jury had indicted, the world had convicted. Why? Because newspaper accounts were so worded as to imply the guilt of the accused, grabbed up by a morbid, unthinking public and echoed parrot-like from lip to lip. Yes, world convicted prisoner first, which is true in a sense, and upon newspaper accounts as evidence.

The stampede and rush and tumbling over one another to proclaim the prisoner guilty, reminds the writer of a flock of sheep. The leader (which is the newspapers) espies a hole in the fence, passes through; immediately there is a rush by the rest of the flock (which are the readers) to see who will be first through after the leader. The writer of this article was one "old sheep in the bunch."

The writer of the article in question says: "The prisoner had a fair trial. We admit that is true as far as the judge was concerned. In fact, right here we wish to express our admiration of the fairness of Judge Watson, but there the matter of fairness ends, as the prisoner had not the ghost of a chance from the start. Prosecutors, witnesses and jury, all drawn from this same flock who had passed through the "hole in the fence."

Will any fairminded brother arise in his place and point out to us where the fairness comes in, or to go a step further, where the legal verdict stands? The law, as we understand, authorizes an acquittal where there is a reasonable doubt, and it would seem to us there was not only a reasonable doubt on the evidence adduced, but a very grave doubt, doubt so strong, indeed, that it would be impossible to get around it by an unbiased mind.

In anotser place, the writer speaks of the prisoner "proving himself innocent." Now, as the writer of this understands the law, the prisoner is not required to prove himself innocent, but it devolves upon the prosecution to prove him guilty, which, as we look upon it, was not done sufficiently clear to insure a legal verdict of guilty.

It is inconceivable as to how any thinking person could be led to believe that a man of the intelligence of the accused would conceive, plan and commit a crime of the magnitude of this one along the lines laid down by the prosecution. Why, to believe the story would tax the credulity of a school boy. Such a plan would be the work of a lunatic or an imbecile, and certainly this man is neither. Why, a ten-year-old school boy would not commission another who stood ready to do him an injury if the opportunity offered, to buy him an old shotgun, which could be identified with perfect ease, to commit a murder with; then boldly take the same gun back and boldly proclaim it as the one which did the deed, with only his unsupported word that it was in the hands of another when the crime was committed.

It would tax the credulity of "Mrs. Credulous" far beyond the limit. Yet upon such a belief, based upon circumstantial evidence alone, the verdict was rendered.

Now if this is fairness we have always misunderstood the word.

The writer of this article wishes to state emphatically and unequivocally his belief in the innocence of the accused, based upon the evidence and not of any personal knowledge or acquaintanceship of any of the parties in question.

"CITIZEN."

Richmond.

Mr. Blake and the Doctors.

To the Editor of The Times-Dispatch:

Sir,—At a meeting of the Grounds and Building Committee last night your reporter misquoted me regarding what I said about the doctors. What I did say was in reference to the doctors of the Board of Health, and that was said in jest. No man has a higher regard for the medical profession than I, and no one calls for a doctor when sick quicker than I do.

The committee on this occasion was in a humorous mood, occasioned by several propositions presented to us that we regarded as ridiculous. I had no idea that there was a reporter within a mile of us. Please make this correction for me, and oblige

GEO. McD. BLAKE.

Richmond, September 22.

ROYAL
BAKING-POWDER
Absolutely Pure

MAKES HOME BAKING EASY

Light Biscuit
Delicious Cake
Dainty Pastries
Fine Puddings
Flaky Crusts

The only Baking Powder made from Royal Grape Cream of Tartar

EMPEROR WILLIAM SHOWS DISPLEASURE

BY LA MARQUISE DE FONTENOY.

EMPEROR WILLIAM is manifestly of the opinion that whatever sympathies he may have enjoyed on the part of the Czar are on the wane. He has given evidence thereof by suddenly recalling, not his ambassador at St. Petersburg, Count Pourtales, but Major-General von Lauenstein, who since the spring has been attached to the suite of Emperor Nicholas, as a member of his military household, with the title of German military plenipotentiary at St. Petersburg. He wore with his Prussian uniform the aiguillettes of the aides-de-camp of Emperor Nicholas. At the court of Berlin, an analogous position is filled by Major-General Tatichtcheff, of the Russian army.

The office has no connection whatsoever with that of naval or military attache of embassy. The arrangement, which exists in the case of no other governments, dates back to the beginning of the nineteenth century, when the relations beween the reigning houses of Russia and Prussia were so intimate, (the consort of Nicholas I. being a daughter of Queen Louise of Prussia, and a sister of King Frederick William IV. and of old Emperor William,) that most of the confidential offices of the household of the Czar and Czarina were filled by Prussians, while the Russian government undertook the transportation to Siberia, and the maintenance in penal servitude there, of all the Prussians who had in one way or another given offense to their ruler at Berlin. Indeed, at one time there were several thousands of Germans undergoing punishment in Siberia; not for any offenses in or against Russia, but because they had incurred while in Germany the displeasure of the Prussian government, which had no penal colony of its own.

It was in those days, when, according to Bismarck, Prussia used to be ruled, not from Berlin, but from St. Petersburg, that, with the object of still further cementing the ties between the courts, Czar Nicholas I. selected one of his favorite aides-de-camp to serve as a member of the immediate entourage of the King of Prussia, while the latter, in a similar way, delegated one of his aides-de-camp to serve on the personal staff of the Czar, these officers being used, among other things, for the transmission of those communications between the two courts and the sovereigns that it was not convenient to send through the embassies, or through the departments of foreign affairs.

Until six months ago this position was held at St. Petersburg by Rear Admiral von Hintze, of the German navy, who has made a particular study of naval defense. Occupying a confidential position of this kind in the household of the Czar, it was very difficult to prevent him from becoming acquainted, more or less completely, with the character of the new scheme of secret defenses of Cronstadt and of St. Petersburg. Perhaps he was unable to entirely conceal the interest which he took in these defenses, on which the Russian government is spending over $100,000,000, and which are notoriously intended to protect the metropolis from an attack by the German navy. At any rate, he was recalled at the request of the Czar, and instead of being assigned to any command at sea, was appointed as minister plenipotentiary in Mexico, for the purpose of keeping an eye on the various Central American republics, and especially upon the Panama Canal, and its defensive works. He was replaced at St. Petersburg by Major-General von Lauenstein, and the latter, who like Admiral von Hintze, is of bourgeois birth, and owes his admission to the lowest rank of the nobility to the Kaiser, has now been called upon to make way for Lieutenant-General Count Alfred von Dohna-Schlobitten, who until now has commanded the division of cavalry of the Guard at Berlin, and who was the chief of the military suite of the German crown-prince, on the occasion of the latter's visits last winter to India, to Egypt, and afterwards, to Rome and St. Petersburg.

The Dohnas are one of the very oldest houses of the German aristocracy, and are not merely counts, but also burgraves, an ancient title superior to that of count, and which they received from Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, at Merseburg, in 1153, when it was conferred upon Henricus, of Donyn, or Dohna, in Saxony. The head of the family, who is one of the most intimate friends of the Emperor, was created a prince eleven years ago, and makes his home at Schlobitten, a grand old place in Eastern Prussia, which with its superb and immense park, shaded by glorious trees, has been in the uninterrupted possession of the family since the fourteenth century. The name of Dohna is recorded in all the most important pages of German, and more especially of Prussian history. Statesmen, generals, and in particular confidants and cronies of their successive sovereigns, have borne that name, and there is not a King who has reigned over Prussia, nor, previous to that, any elector who has reigned over Brandenburg, who has not stayed at the Castle of Schlobitten, and occupied the antiquated four-poster bed in which the present Emperor sleeps whenever he pays a visit there.

Some forty years ago, the name of Dohna came quite prominently before the American public, in connection with the presence in New York of Countess Anna Dohna, an elderly lady, who claimed to have been the secret wife of old Emperor William. She made her home for a time in a large house in Lexington Avenue, which she furnished handsomely, and she never seemed to want for money. Those who intimated that she was drawing upon her imagination, she referred to the Prussian "Staats Anzeiger," (or Berlin Official Gazette,) which in its number of June 4, 1829, contains a royal decree, signed by King Frederick William III. of Prussia, which reads as follows: "By order of His Majesty the King: Anna Countess Dohna, having claimed to be the wife of Prince William of Prussia, I hereby decree that such a union, if it ever took place, be null and void. (Signed) Frederick William, Rex. Countersigned, Anthony von Altenstein, Secretary of State." According to her own story, she met the late Emperor William in 1825, during the lifetime of his father, King Frederick William III. of Prussia, when she was sixteen years of age. She declared that after several clandestine meetings, they were married late one night, at Clegnitz, in Silesia, by a young country pastor. The latter did not know the prince, who gave the name of "William, Count Brandenburg," and his occupation as "an officer of the Royal Guards." The marriage certificate was made out, and then her husband told her that it would be expedient to keep their union secret for a time. When, at length, urged by her entreaties, her husband revealed their marriage to his father, King Frederick William III., the latter flew into a terrible rage, forced him to sign a renunciation of the countess's hand, and she was conveyed to a small castle near Koenigsburg, in East Prussia, where she was kept a close prisoner for years. In 1837—always according to her story—she succeeded in escaping, and crossing the Polish frontier, reached Warsaw, where in the following year she was recognized at a state performance of the opera, given by Czar Nicholas I. in honor of King Frederick William III., and of his younger son, Prince William, then visiting the Russian court.

She was arrested at the theatre, and on the following morning conveyed to Eastern Russia, where she was retained under strict surveillance until the death of Frederick William III. in 1840 led to her release. She was then permitted to return to Prussia, and the new King, William IV., offered to compromise the matter with her on a financial basis. This she refused to do, her father's death having placed her at the time in possession of a large fortune. She spent several years in traveling.

(Copyright, 1911, by the Brentwood Association.)

Why Does Not a Hen Crow?

I Wonder Why! See To-Morrow's Times-Dispatch