

men. It is not necessary to ponder over the probable motive. Whether it be selfish or otherwise the suggestion is morally indefensible.

S. D.



To Avoid War.

Americans and Englishmen in and near Mexico should be careful how they disappear from public sight, lest the jingoes force us into war to avenge their death, while they are merely on a journey.

S. C.



Monarchs Protect No One.

The Chicago New World, commenting in its issue of February 27 on a statement in a recent address by Louis F. Post to the effect that a king never protects anybody, says: "Now this is not only misleading, it is absolutely untrue. Monarchies do protect the rights of their subjects." This looks very much like distortion. Monarchies do, sometimes, protect the rights of their people but monarchs do not. Protection extended in the name of the king is in fact extended by the nation over which he assumes to rule. Without the labor and intelligence of the nation there would be no benefit whatever conferred by the government, no matter what its form may be. The monarch may, and frequently does, assume credit for these benefits, but he is never justly entitled thereto. In every case he can be eliminated without loss. Protection, under any form of government, is conferred by the people only.

S. D.



Saving the Country.

About this time, as the old almanac would say, look out for the noisy mouthings of cheap patriots in Congress, who have failed in all other ways to attract attention.

S. C.



Unfair Discrimination.

Announcement is made that hereafter the administration of the tariff will not be so rigorous as regards returning tourists. Under the old order passengers might include in the \$100 worth of goods entitled to free entry only wearing apparel and toilet articles intended for their own use. Dress goods and the like paid full duty. Under the new regulations passengers are to be exempted to the extent of \$100 as regards practically all kinds of articles purchased abroad, including presents for relatives and friends, such as table linen, cloth, household goods, cutlery and the like. This is the grossest kind of partiality. By what right does the government presume to say that the well-

to-do woman who buys a table cloth in Paris shall have the tariff remitted, while the poor woman at home, who has the cloth sent to her by parcel post, must pay the duty. This is an attempt to make tyranny tolerable by stopping the cries of those whose protests are loudest. The law should bear upon all alike, and it should make not a particle of difference to the Treasury Department whether a pocket knife is brought into the country or sent in by mail. Not so much as a tooth brush should be exempted. If revenue laws are to be respected, let them be made respectable.

S. C.



A Fundamental Measure.

It must be admitted by Democrats that we cannot be rid of the Trust family by even killing off Mother Tariff; and it may possibly be good political maneuvering to try regulating them. But before democratic hopes dare mount, it must be boldly recognized that the only real remedy is to get at the fundamental cause and kill off Father Privilege. Reservation of Radium Deposits therefore looms large as compared with any possible regulation measures, for it will prevent an addition to the family.

W. G. STEWART.



Censorship in Chicago.

Government censorship, whether of speech, the press, or the drama, is objectionable. It may be inspired by the purest and most altruistic motive but it remains objectionable nevertheless. Whatever the evils of liberty may be they are not as great as those of censorship. Consequently the establishment in Chicago of police censorship of moving picture plays is a move in the wrong direction. From all accounts the work of the censors needs censorship. These censors are unquestionably honest and reasonably intelligent. But they necessarily must have some views on what should be suppressed with which others, equally honest and intelligent, do not agree. So that, even from the standpoint of the motive which inspired the censorship, their decisions must prove to be unreasonable and tyrannical. Moreover, being human, they are apt to feel sensitive concerning films which are not altogether respectful to the police. So it is not surprising that in films of this kind, immorality has been discovered, not visible to one not connected with the police department. The beginning of a "lese majeste" tyranny seems foreshadowed here. It should be nipped in the bud. Ordinary business sense will prevent owners of moving picture theaters, without any police cen-