

# Working for Converts to Channel Tunnel Scheme

### Questions of Profit, of Food Supply, of Use in Peace and of Control in War Time Discussed, Showing Consensus of Opinion in Its Favor.

## ADVANCE OF SCIENCE MAKES IT FEASIBLE NOW

(Special Dispatch.)

LONDON, July 26. MEMBERS of Parliament who are anxious to see the construction of the long delayed Channel tunnel accomplished, are working hard to get converts to their ranks, and the memorial to the Prime Minister on the subject is gaining fresh signatures daily. The prospects are now held to be highly encouraging, especially as many of the military opponents of the scheme of a few years ago are now no longer hostile to the scheme.

Recent despatches from the other side showing how submarine tunnels benefit New York and how in the same way a Channel tunnel would increase the traffic between England and France have attracted some attention here. It is quoted and commented upon by the Daily Graphic, which is once more to the front in advocating the construction of the tunnel.

"The developments of the traffic through the Hudson River tunnels at New York," it says, "may be taken as a very striking illustration of what we may expect from a Channel tunnel between England and France. In comparing the remarkable increase on the Hudson River with the possible increase of passenger traffic between England and France it is interesting to refer to a preliminary report on the volume of passenger and goods traffic likely to pass through the Channel tunnel and on the estimated revenue, expenditure and profits of the undertaking as prepared by an independent official expert in January, 1907.

"This report gives four estimates of the probable increase in passenger traffic—assuming that the tunnel would be open in 1915, and the most interesting and reliable of these is perhaps the estimate of Mr. Albert Sartiaux, author of the celebrated pamphlet 'Le Tunnel Sous la Manche.' He concluded that the tunnel would be likely to attract ninety per cent of the passengers via Calais and Boulogne, seventy per cent of the passengers via Havre and Ostend, twenty per cent of the passengers via Flushing and fifty per cent of the passengers via the Hook of Holland."

Route	Actual Number of Passengers During Last of 1910	Estimated Increase in 1915	Estimated Increase in 1920
Calais	22,915	71,680	294,702
Boulogne	252,760	148,850	401,610
Dieppe	216,502	63,280	279,882
Havre	45,521	18,520	64,173
Ostend	126,994	22,111	159,105
Flushing	97,872	28,851	126,723
Antwerp	61,025	29,110	90,135
Hook of Holland	104,771	35,080	139,851
Probable total for 1915		1,633,191	
Other lines		137,809	
Total		1,800,000	

From this total Mr. Sartiaux estimated that the patrons of the tunnel would number 1,100,000 if it be opened for traffic by 1915, without taking account of the fillip caused by the opening of the tunnel, which would very probably increase the movement of passengers during the first year by at least twenty per cent, and would carry the total movement from the start to at least 1,300,000 passengers.

## DIFFICULTIES EASILY OVERCOME.

Mr. John Leyland, well known as an authority on naval matters, in an interview with your correspondent did not discuss the points in favor of the tunnel which have been discussed by others as much as the difficulties which have to be overcome.

"The conclusion of the entente cordiale with France," he said, "has certainly placed the matter in a new light. Possibly a fresh inquiry into the question would show that British naval and military authorities not only now see no objection to the tunnel but a positive advantage. In the past there has been practically a consensus of opinion contrary to the proposal.

"No practical difficulties exist that engineers could not surmount, and since Mr. De Gamond began investigations, in 1838, and Sir John Hawkshaw and Mr. Brunel made their soundings and borings, from 1865 to 1868, science and practice have advanced enormously. Nor does anybody question that very great advantages would result in closer relations between the British Isles and the Continent, especially perhaps in the possibility of supplying the kingdom in war time with food, of which it is destitute. Year in and year out supplies pour in day and night to the value of £3,000 a minute, and the country has seldom in stock more than six weeks' supplies of wheat.

"But even with such facts before them the naval and military authorities set their faces against the projected tunnel. The naval objection has been that the tunnel would be a means of approach and communication which would evade naval attack. Sir A. Cooper-Key, First Sea Lord, when the question was raised about 1890, protested very strongly. Admiral Sir John Hay said nothing was impossible in war and that 60,000 men might be landed to seize the tunnel, after which the reinforcement and supply of an army could go on unimpeded.

"Lord Wolsey stated that the tunnel would be the most indestructible line of communication in the world. To say its seizure was impossible was to impute to the general charged with the operation complete ignorance of the business of war. He said also it was too great a responsibility to lay upon a commandant at Dover to expect him to destroy the tunnel without orders, and yet if he did not act at once action would come too late. The Duke of Cambridge, Sir John Lintorn Simmons and other officers were of the same mind.

"But thirty years has worked a revolution. France and England are friends and there are British and doubtless French soldiers who think it would be an excellent thing if the British expeditionary force could be promptly despatched to the Continent at need. Possibly there are sea officers who would be glad to be relieved of some of the responsibility for protecting food supplies—in time of war, the Continent could spare any. On the whole, British naval opinion is likely to be against the proposal, because of the possibly reduced value which the public, relieved of some anxiety about its food supplies, might set upon the service.

## NOW QUITE PRACTICAL.

Major W. H. Gastrell, M. P., for North Lambeth, is enthusiastically in favor of a Channel tunnel. "The advance in electrical science makes the project far more practical than formerly," said Major Gastrell. "Moreover, it has largely removed the danger from such a tunnel in time of war. It would not be necessary now to blow up or flood an immensely valuable piece of property. Either nation could prevent the passage of trains simply by cutting off the power in its half of the tunnel."

As indications of the wonders that have been wrought in recent years through electric railways, Major Gaskell cited the Bakerloo tube, which runs near his house in Clarence Terrace, Regent's Park. Houses in Baker street which used to rent for £50 a year now bring £500, and the entire character of the neighborhood has changed. Electric railway connection between England and France would have an equally stimulating effect, he thinks.

With an electric railway under the Channel it would be possible to go from London to Paris in five hours, and travel would increase by at least fifty per cent. In its food supply England would benefit decidedly by a tunnel. Fruits and vegetables which now arrive after a slow passage by boat would reach us fresher and with less loss in transit. Produce could be packed in France in the morning and sold in London the same night.

"We do not want any government money," he continued. "Let permission be given to construct the tunnel and it can be financed in twenty-four hours."

## NO DANGER OF SEIZURE.

Mr. Russell Lea, M. P., said he was one of those who had been in favor of the project since it was first suggested.

"The arguments raised against such a tunnel from the military standpoint always seemed absurd to me," he said, "and they are still more so to-day in view of the progress of electrical science. It has been said that a hostile fleet might capture the English terminus of the tunnel and then bring troops across into British domain with no one to stop them. But control of the tunnel can extend farther than the English terminal. There is nothing to prevent electric connection with London itself. I am not an engineer, but I know enough of electrical possibilities to realize that it would be simple to provide equipment whereby the tunnel might be closed, or part of it flooded or blown up, if necessary, by merely pressing a button at the War Office."

Mr. Rea was asked if he believed, with Lord Rotherham, that Great Britain's insularity was no longer an issue because it had already been destroyed by the aeroplane. "That may or may not be so," he answered. "Any one who wants to believe it is welcome to do so. I don't care by what mental processes others convince themselves of the wisdom of a Channel tunnel, just so they favor it."

Mr. Rea said that engineers did not think that a Channel tunnel presented any particular difficulties from the standpoint of construction. The tubes would pass all the way through a workable clay. Present experience in ventilating long tunnels was such, he thought, that air could be provided for a stretch of twenty miles as easily as for shorter distances in existing tunnels.

Mr. Rea said that the provisional committee, which is now considering the project in the House of Commons, represented all shades of political belief and it was the purpose to make the issue a non-party question. Owing to pressure of business, it was not likely that the matter could be brought up at the present session of Parliament, but it was the hope of friends of the project to pledge enough members to its support so as to insure subsequent passage of a law permitting the construction of a tunnel.

The Hon. Walter Guinness, M. P., said that he was still of an open mind in regard to the proposed tunnel. There could be no doubt of its advantages commercially and as a guarantee of food supply in case of war, and the only question was as to whether it would be a menace from the standpoint of national defence.

"If the War Office is satisfied that a tunnel would not be a danger from the military point of view," he said, "I am heartily in favor of its construction. It is most desirable that we should have a secondary means of getting food in case of war, because in such event cargo and insurance rates would go up greatly on all

# TWO QUEENS DRIVE THROUGH LONDON IN THE CAUSE OF CHARITY.



ALEXANDRA DAY IN LONDON—A CHARMING PICTURE IN THE ROW. Queen Alexandra Day really was a remarkable day in the London season. Not only were Mr. Poincare and other notabilities moving from place to place in London, but Queen Alexandra and Queen Mary, accompanied by Princess Victoria and Princess Mary, also made a progress through the streets on behalf of the hospital funds, which benefit by the sale of the artificial wild roses.

## ONCE OPPOSED, NOW SUPPORTER.

Sir William Bull is one of those members of Parliament who, at one time vigorous opponents of the Channel tunnel scheme, are now among its most earnest supporters, because, as he admits, all the old arguments against it and all the old misunderstandings have been swept away.

"I believe the tunnel would be an immense boon to trade in England," he said. "A great many more of our people would travel on the Continent, and the other nations of Europe would flock to England in greater numbers than ever. Trains could be run direct to our seaports for Canada and America. And in a thousand ways the tunnel would bring nearer the cosmopolitan millennium which many earnest thinkers are dreaming about. The recent royal marriage in Germany is striking evidence of the fact that when peoples meet misunderstandings blow away."

Sir Thomas Barclay is another member of Parliament who believes strongly in the immense increase of traffic, both personal and business, which would result from the construction of a Channel tunnel.

"It would," he said, "naturally tell to the advantage of both England and France. But the main reason why I should like to see the tunnel constructed is that it will promote peace and harmony between the two nations, for experience proves that the more intimately any two nations are brought together for purposes of business, pleasure and general intercourse the less likelihood there is of any estrangement taking place between them."

## ALL PARTIES IN ITS FAVOR.

Mr. Arthur Feil, chairman of the provisional committee in the House of Commons which proposes to ask the government to grant permission for building a tunnel under the English Channel, said that he believed practically all the liberal and labor members and a majority of the unionists favored the plan, sentiment having changed remarkably within recent years from opposition to approval. Mr. Feil declared that it was the intention to make the agitation for the tunnel on non-partisan lines, and that although a deputation probably will go before the Premier, Mr. Asquith, in favor of the plan soon it is not expected that Parliamentary action can be obtained at the present session.

Why? A class in guessing, I'm afraid. Would find me at the foot; For why does beauty always fade, For while homeliness stays put?

# Professor Petrie Finds Ass' Head 7,400 Years Old

### Relics of 5500 B. C., Found in Egypt, Show Attempted Robbery of Tomb 3,000 Years Later by Man Who Was Crushed by Fall of Roof.

(Special Dispatch.)

LONDON, July 26. VERY interesting is the exhibition that has been opened at University College representing the pick of the "finds" made by Professor Flinders Petrie in Egypt during the last few months under the auspices of the British School of Archaeology.

The excavations were made at Memphis, founded by Menes, the first King of the first dynasty, and now known as the village of Mitrahneh, Tarikhah, the capital before Memphis, and Riqgeh, the present Italian town. All these places are close together near the Nile and between forty and fifty miles south of Cairo.

Many of the objects to be seen at Gower street are as old as the first dynasty, which may be placed at about 5500 B. C. To the period of this dynasty belongs an ass' head, in excellent preservation. It was found buried in the courtyard of a family burial place of an Egyptian of high rank and near at hand was buried the pet duck of the Egyptian. This is the first time that the skeleton of an ass of such antiquity has been discovered, and it should be of special interest to equine anatomists.

But the gem of the collection is a gold pectoral of lapis lazuli, turquoise and carnelian. The only other like specimen is in the Cairo Museum. Professor Petrie considers that the sceptre which forms a part of the design indicates that it was worn as a symbol of high rank and authority, the same as British orders of knighthood are worn on the breast.

This jewel was nearly lost to posterity. The excavators found it in a large stone tomb, and there was evidence that a thief had entered the tomb with the obvious intention of carrying away the valuables it contained. He must have crawled in by a very small hole, still to be seen, and been then overwhelmed by the collapse of the roof of the sepulchre. His crushed skeleton was discovered superimposed on the skeleton of the man whose grave he went to rob. But all this happened thousands of years ago, in the days of the twelfth dynasty—2800 to 2500 B. C.—to which the pectoral belongs. Yet the attempted crime has only just been brought to light. Of almost equal interest is a Zam sceptre and a Uas sceptre. Both are of

wood, both have Phoenix heads at the crook and both have a forked foot at the end. But whereas the former has an undulating stem, the latter has a perfectly straight stem. They were found beside the body of a high priest called Sa-Uast and were the magic wands used by those functionaries. These are the first specimens that have ever been found, though it was known that the high priests of ancient Egypt carried such wands.

The collection contains many articles of personal adornment, such as necklaces, and a great quantity of beads and stones more or less precious, in various stages of preparation for being made up into articles of jewelry. There are also a great many connected with the toilette of the ancient Egyptians, especially those used in painting the eyes.

## WESTMINSTER HALL'S OAK ROOF CRUMBLING

(Special Dispatch.)

LONDON, July 26. LATELY everybody has been alarmed, with good reason, about the safety of the foundations of St. Paul's Cathedral. Now it is the turn of an even more ancient building, Westminster Hall, which is closed for repairs. It is true that the stonework of "the great Hall of William Rufus" is not threatened like that of the Cathedral, but the cleaning operations on the interior of the open roof have disclosed a very serious condition of affairs.

The Irish oak, of which that roof is composed, has been attacked for years past by worms and is now in such a state that it has been found necessary to take out whole portions of it, in some cases large portions, and replace them with new wood.

This hammer beam roof, which has been deemed one of the finest carpentering feats in the whole world, did not form part of the hall as originally constructed by William Rufus in 1099, but was added in 1397 by Richard II. The extension of which it formed part was a notable architectural performance, for the walls were carried up two feet higher, and not only were the windows altered but a fine new porch was included in the scheme.

The roof, with its hammer beams carved with angels, was built according to the designs of the master mason of the period, Henry de Veveley.

# Breach of Promise Suits Now a Topic of Discussion

### Outcome of the Northampton Case Leads Many in England to Favor Abolition of Such Actions, but Others Vigorously Maintain Present Law.

## STATUS OF CHORUS GIRLS IS VASTLY IMPROVED

(Special Dispatch.)

LONDON, July 26. ALL the world and his wife are still talking of the record damages of £250,000 in the breach of promise case in which Lord Northampton paid up without letting the case go to trial. The questions which it has incidentally brought to the front have an interest for men and women alike, for all who are parents, for all who are lovers—for all grades of human society, in fact.

They are not new questions by any means, for they have brought tragedy into innumerable lives at one time or another, and will continue to do so. However far the State may proceed in taking over the responsibilities of parenthood—and the eugenists would have it assume the right of forbidding marriage at all in the case of the mentally or physically unfit—there will always be fathers, if not mothers, who believe themselves entitled to sanction or veto the matrimonial arrangements of their sons and daughters if they think it desirable to do so. Equally will there always be sons and daughters of sufficient independence of spirit to claim to do as they wish in so entirely personal and individual a matter as marriage.

The question that many are asking is: Who make the best peewees? And the topic of the Markham versus Northampton case has set everybody discussing, with widely differing opinions, some going so far as to say that actions for breach of promise of marriage should be abolished altogether.

The Rev. F. B. Meyer, who is known in America as in England for his strong views on the marriage and divorce question, was very outspoken in favor of the existing law. "I think it is quite fair," he said. "If a man makes an offer to a girl and does not keep it he must pay. Poor people manage these things much better than the middle classes and the rich. They walk out together without actually being engaged, and both parties have a chance of knowing each other. Better class people, on the other hand, only meet each other at balls or parties or in the green room of the theatre, and consequently know little of each other before engagement."

"In America, now, a young fellow can take a girl to a theatre, a concert or a picnic without being considered engaged."

## A SIMPLE PROPOSITION.

"Actions for breach of promise of marriage ought no more to be abolished than actions for the breach of any other contract," said Mr. Freke Palmer, a well known solicitor. "If a man becomes engaged to a girl and then breaks off because he has become attached to another he must pay. It is a simple proposition. The girl has suffered damage because her chances of marriage have been lessened through sticking to one man for several years. Then she suffers in feelings. A jilted girl is jilted at her friends, and generally she is made to feel small."

"It is all very well to say that it is a sordid thing to bring beautiful sentiment down to a commonplace monetary transaction. But women must have some recompense, and the only recompense is money. The only way to punish men who break contracts is through their pockets. Defendants who have no money unfortunately cannot be punished at all."

"The danger of such actions," said Mr. Fairfax, the chairman of the Divorce Law Reform Union, "is that they may lead to compulsory marriages and, therefore, to matrimonial difficulties in the future. Evidence on this point was given before the Divorce Commission when Mr. C. H. Pickstone, solicitor, of Radcliffe, said that breach of promise actions should be abolished. Numerous marriages take place under a threat of an action and subsequent misery to both

sides. "Money is no compensation in a breach of promise case for what a woman loses," she said. "This is particularly true when the woman is an actress. Let me warn every woman, whatever her situation. No damages ever invented are payment. The money is no use. It seems to do you no good. It almost marks itself as not your own money. Let any woman who finds herself in the position of bringing a breach of promise suit consider many times before she takes a step she will always regret."

"The young men and the old men of society think they can go further with an actress just because she is an actress. They talk to her freely, they go about with her freely, they make havoc of her affections with a feeling of irresponsibility which is in itself an insult. Then when they grow tired, when they have compromised her by leading her to think she is engaged, when all the world has coupled their names together, they throw her aside. All this because she is an actress. Is she not also a woman? Why should men unscrupulously do to an actress what the rules of social honor do not permit them to do to their friends' sisters, what in fact they dare not do?"

"One day a man forgets. Only a woman knows what a woman's memory is to a woman."

## New Royal Romance Has Delighted All England

(Special Dispatch.)

LONDON, July 26. THE return of the court to Buckingham Palace has partly revived the gaieties of London, which for more than a week have been rather of a spasmodic character, consisting of impromptu small dinners, dances and bridge parties. Something was wanted to awaken society and society certainly found it in the most interesting event of the whole season, the betrothal of the handsome and popular Prince Arthur of Connaught and the Duchess of Fife. The announcement aroused tremendous interest throughout the kingdom. All the world loves a royal romance, and this betrothal of two of the most popular personages in the royal circle appeals to the English with particular force.

It is practically certain that the wedding in October will be the occasion of a national celebration. The Duchess of Connaught and the Princess Royal are understood to have expressed themselves in favor of a ceremonial wedding, and the Queen herself desires the happy occasion to be marked by fitting celebrations.

(Special Dispatch.)

would have a direct bearing on the question of divorce. "A woman should suffer in silence," said Mrs. Harold Gorst, the well known writer and author of "The Soul of Milly Green." "All actions for breach of promise should be abolished. But this is not the view of all women, many of whom argue that if a man breaks his promise he should pay because the woman has lost a chance of being supported. To me the idea is repulsive, and I cannot understand how any woman can cheapen her feelings by bringing such an action. It is a great confession of weakness. It is much better if a girl has been jilted that she should laugh as if she did not care at all—yes, though she suffer in secret."

STAGE NEEDS NO VINDICATION. That the social status of the stage needs no vindication nowadays is the opinion of Mr. Frank Boyd, editor of the Pelican, a weekly paper which is devoted mainly to the profession. "Apart from those ladies of the stage who would adorn any circle which they may enter," he said, "it is not always sufficiently realized, perhaps, that the whole standard of the profession is vastly different from all old fashioned conceptions of it. To go no higher in the ranks of the profession than the chorus, you may take it that the chorus girl of the London stage of to-day is a nice, well spoken, well educated girl of a very good class of society. One need only be present at a voice trial such as takes place any day to realize this. She has usually received an excellent musical education, and can read music at sight. She receives, certainly at the leading theatres, a very good salary in proportion to the amount of work actually required of her, and she is a bright, attractive, clever girl. Her matrimonial opportunities are possibly brighter than those of the same class of girl in any other occupation, and she has the feminine tact and adaptability to circumstances which enable her to comport herself becomingly in any society in which she may find herself."

It is only one who has been placed just as Daisy Markham, however, and has lived some years afterward who can give the answer to the position of a woman in such circumstances.

So said Miss Birdie Sutherland, who accepted £25,000 damages against the Hon. Dudley Marjoribanks. Miss Sutherland retains all her beauty, and her staturesque figure is perhaps more commanding and more gracious now than when it was the wonder of the London stage.

"Money is no compensation in a breach of promise case for what a woman loses," she said. "This is particularly true when the woman is an actress. Let me warn every woman, whatever her situation. No damages ever invented are payment. The money is no use. It seems to do you no good. It almost marks itself as not your own money. Let any woman who finds herself in the position of bringing a breach of promise suit consider many times before she takes a step she will always regret."

"The young men and the old men of society think they can go further with an actress just because she is an actress. They talk to her freely, they go about with her freely, they make havoc of her affections with a feeling of irresponsibility which is in itself an insult. Then when they grow tired, when they have compromised her by leading her to think she is engaged, when all the world has coupled their names together, they throw her aside. All this because she is an actress. Is she not also a woman? Why should men unscrupulously do to an actress what the rules of social honor do not permit them to do to their friends' sisters, what in fact they dare not do?"

"One day a man forgets. Only a woman knows what a woman's memory is to a woman."

Anglo-Americans was seen in the paddock. Lady Essex was there, accompanied by her husband. She was dressed in becomingly elegant colored linen on shafting, with small toque.

Mrs. Montagu Sharpe was in blue charmuse, with yellow feathers in her hat. She brought several friends with her from Chippinham Park, including Lady Downshire, Friesland a Lady Annesley, and Cora Lady Stratford.

Also present were Mr. and Mrs. Rochfort Maguire, the latter in smoke gray with white feathers in her hat, and Mrs. Chaune and her sister, Miss Harriet Phipps.

Lady Newmann had a party from her horse at Top Hill. The Burdett-Coutts rose and tea garden party at Ivy Lodge also was spoiled by the rain, and at the last moment telegrams were sent to all the guests to come to the Town House, in Stratton street, instead. It was crowded with a merry party. The American Ambassador was there with Mrs. and Miss Page. Lady Newborough was another Anglo-American who responded, as did also Mr. Chauncey M. Depew.

On the same night the Ambassador and his wife attended Mr. and Mrs. Walker Rubens' concert at Etonmores Gardens, the Duchess of Marlborough also being present.

The racing at Newmarket naturally took many away from town. The Queen remained in the palace, while the King went on three days. The weather, Thursday excepted, prevented anything like a display of dresses, but a fair sprinkling of