

What the World is Saying

Sensible Mexico.

No doubt Mexico is looked upon by many as a half-civilized state, but its recent proposition, anent the celebration of its centennial, is worthy of consideration by some states that have a lofty opinion of themselves. Mexico proposes to inaugurate public improvements in every town, and have the towns finish them, during the year, if possible. The centennial will, therefore, record itself in streets, avenues, drives, parks, gardens, schools, libraries, fountains, water systems and public buildings. Our hats off to Mexico. Whenever we have a centennial the first consideration is, How much powder can we burn? The next, How many strangers can we gather into town, ostensibly to look at parades, but actually to be decoyed into our places of amusement and entertainment; and the next, how much of an exhibition we can make, of dry goods, engines and squashes. The Jamestown Exhibition will be a memory in another year, but the Mexico Centennial will leave its good results to posterity, for its long rejoicement.—Brooklyn Eagle.

Reckless Automobilists.

The accident near South Norwalk, Conn., adds only one or two to the season's long list of automobile fatalities. But the affair is thoroughly characteristic of the quite general conduct of automobilists. The fast young man of wealth and his wife were trying to make a record run on the public highway. They had frequently before been doing the same thing. It is said that they had been in several smash-ups previously, and no doubt considered them great fun—court-ting serious danger having become necessary for the stimulation of a jaded appetite for pleasure. They were at this, as at other times, not merely showing light regard for their own safety, but exhibiting no regard whatever for the safety of others using the same highway. They were racing with another machine, which might also properly have gone to smash, and in the contest of speed they ran against a horse carriage and tipped the women occupants into the road. And in thus exhibiting a criminal recklessness concerning the lives of others, they brought their own wretched, sensation-seeking existence to an end in one case and near to it in the other. It is a hard saying, but is it not a true one—such persons die as the fool dieth and risk death as doth the fool.—Springfield Republican.

State Court Judges Across the Line.

A few weeks ago certain American lawyers of some distinction who were travelling in England cabled home their impressions of the English judge. The picture was that of the legal pedant, moving ponderously, speaking solemnly, living narrowly, lacking practicality, dressed unspeakably. Judicial gollywogs, they were called. Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, who has just returned from travelling in France and England, has a different opinion. He says that comparison of the judicial systems of France, England, and America results unfavorably to this country. Not that our judges are lacking in common sense—they perhaps excel the French and English judges in that respect. It is in regard to their judicial qualifications that they fall short. And they fall short in judicial qualifications because of our system of selection—because we elect instead of appoint, and because our system is not such as to make the law a subject of lifelong judicial study. This criticism he would not apply to the judges of the federal courts, but only to those of the state courts. The choice is not between common sense and learning. We cannot rest content with the reply that if we have the common sense we're willing to let Europe have the learning. For our conditions are constantly becoming more complex, are constantly demanding men on the benches who know the law from its first to its last letter—who are thereby prepared to solve the great legal problems which our industrial life is constantly unfolding before us. It is said so often

that the poor and the public are almost defenceless against the rich and the incorporated, who are able to buy up the best counsel procurable. Too little has the public realized the protection to be found in the learned and independent judge. In some instances entire states have shown a woeful blindness to this protection. The cases of Arkansas and Alabama are in point. They have sought to prevent access to the federal tribunals—the best courts before which litigants might go—in some cases. We need a little less politics and a little more independence, a little less superficiality and judicial pretense on our benches. We need it for our own individual sakes and the sake of the country.—New York Globe.

Spain's Low Educational Status.

A Spaniard who was walking with a German visitor in a Madrid street not long ago stopped to shake hands with a beggar—an old acquaintance who used to be a public school teacher, but had become blind. "Do not pity me," said the beggar; "when I was a teacher I often went hungry. Now I take in two or three pesetas a day and am comfortable." The pay of a Spanish school teacher is at most 600 pesetas (\$120) a year, and may be only one-half of that. When the King, in his recent address, made no mention whatever of the education question, there was much surprise and criticism in some quarters. This changed to indignation when there followed a royal edict recommending those communities whose expenses exceeded their income to reduce the school budget by either dropping some of the teachers or reducing all salaries by 100 pesetas. This would affect over 800 teachers. When the Republican, Augustin Sarda, at a session of the Senate, accused the Government of barbarism and folly for exposing to starvation men who had the important duty of rearing good citizens, the minister of education, San Pedro, had no other answer than that the measure was only a temporary makeshift.—Manchester Guardian.

The British and the Continental Views of War.

Another fundamental difference between Great Britain and Continental countries—especially those countries in which militarism prevails—lies in their respective views of warfare, its aims and its methods. We here are wont to look upon a campaign somewhat as knights of the Middle Ages regarded a tournament. Everything must be carried out strictly according to rule, no unfair advantage may be taken of the enemy, who is treated with all the chivalrous consideration due to a noble rival, and the moment he cries "Enough," we ought to sheathe the sword and allow generosity rather than justice to dictate the terms of peace. In a word, war for us is but a glorified game. For military nations, on the contrary, it is a life and death struggle, in the course of which no advantage, fair or unfair, must be spurned. As Bismark put it, each belligerent's aim should be to bleed the other white. War should be destructive, cruel, ruthless, not only in the interests of the stronger of the two adversaries, but also for the sake of the weaker. The formula would seem to be: in war it is humane to be inhuman. Perhaps the advocates of this system are right. But what is certain is that they have an enormous advantage over those who adopt our view that war is a glorified game. They will not be balked out of a possible victory by any Hague Statute forbidding an attack on our warships until a formal declaration of war has been issued; they will not be shamed into making peace on fair terms by fear of moral disapproval; they will continue to beat the enemy long after he is down and helpless; they will cripple him by enormous war contributions and the annexation of whole provinces; and even after peace has been concluded they will try to pick a quarrel anew and ruin irretrievably—in the interests of peace. These views are known to be firmly held and systematically acted upon. We are all aware that Con-

tinental countries will conduct their future campaigns on these lines. But we fail to realize the significance of the fact, and therefore we make little or no provision for what is coming. In truth, the naval fight of the future has already begun at The Hague, and our representatives there evince a generous disposition to make things easy for the foe presumptive, while allowing him to tie his hands. There is no doubt, for instance, that our Government would strictly respect a prohibition to attack the enemy until a formal declaration of war had been made—no matter what advantages we should be foregoing. But is there any doubt that the militarist enemy would do likewise. And if not, why consent to have ourselves handicapped?—The Contemporary Review.

Beauty's Debt to Vaccine.

Beautiful women a century ago evoked the wild enthusiasm of which you write because they were then so few. Smallpox had ruined all complexions, and the few women who had escaped it, who would now only be called ordinarily nice-looking, were then as rare as goddesses, and so worshipped. Forty years ago aged relatives used to tell me stories that puzzled me of ladies in Edinburgh about 1820—of ladies so beautiful that crowds always lined their paths from their carriages to the shops. I used to regret having missed seeing beauties so delightful, little knowing I was really seeing them daily. The milkmaid, accidentally vaccinated in her trade, escaped smallpox, and so gained the repute for fresh complexion that some of us who are older can remember. Vaccination has enabled all women now to equal her in beauty, and her fame has gone, though her looks remain as before. Thanks to Edward Jenner, it is said that we men need not rush in inconvenient crowds when we wish to see a good-looking woman, for in every gathering and by many hearths are women now as lovely as were the famous and fabled beauties of the past.—London Graphic.

"The Baffling of All Science."

Nothing argues a greater want of imagination than the silly chatter about the possible politics and the sex problems and so forth of "the people in Mars." It is like the hugely popular novels describing life in the twenty-first or thirty-first century, and the wonderful inventions and discoveries of our descendants. The people who engage in this talk and write these books are so commonplace and so essentially without imagination that they have to turn to the huge or to the improbable to get any fresh idea or sense of wonder. These are the sort of people who see nothing wonderful on earth save the seven or eight or nine—we forget the number—"wonders of the world" which Mangnall or Pinnock tabulated—as if the composition of a pebble or a pea were not good enough for wonder and the baffling of all science!—London Saturday Review.

Mr. Roosevelt's Hip Pocket Gun.

In a recent editorial the New York Tribune says of any man who habitually carries a pistol that he is, "as a rule, either a coward or a potential or actual criminal. He is himself a menace to peace and order, and should be got rid of for the benefit of the community." Whereupon a democratic paper in New England facetiously remarks that "unless the Tribune omitted that editorial from its Oyster Bay edition a certain well-known resident of that community is likely to leave his pitchfork right in the middle of the hayfield and go up to the city and shoot up the Tribune office." The presence of a pistol in the president's hip pocket is fully justified. There is no reason why his personal and political friends should hesitate on fit occasion to refer to the fact and show why it exists, if, indeed, there are those who need such showing. The president's situation as regards imminent danger is to the last degree exceptional. One-third of all the men who since 1864 have been elected or declared elected to the presidency have fallen by the hands of assassins. Who else in civil or military life fills so dangerous a position as the chief magistracy of this republic? It may be that the fact of having a weapon at hand would not render it available in time of need, but there is no doubt that it would inspire a feeling of greater security, and that is a matter of moment. And it is far from impossible that it might not save a president's life and kill or capture his assailant. At any rate, if ever the present or future president should face an assassin, his countrymen would thank God if he has a gun handy and makes good use of it. As the impecunious country preacher used to borrow a \$5 bill of his well-to-do deacon on Sunday evening so that he might "feel sufficiently braced up to preach a decent sermon," on the same principle it is well that a president should feel the comforting and sustaining influence of a good gun within easy reach in time of peril.—Washington Star.



In the group of British journalists last month was a man there were representatives of political opinion.

SUCCESS IS BASED ON CHARACTER

ture and the prob- that policy in mo- number, the repro- known the world- not an active pa- last called on for- had been most o- Western Canada- by the conditions- prairie," said he, with his own ind- by the exercise o- ergy, is developin- to the country th- There is a great- the most impor- teaches is that, o- pends more on o- fortune, or anythi- individual; and wh- of individuals? T- character is devel- integrity, industry- fused and most- long run, the mo- vanced. This is a- and it becomes m- zation progresses.

Not, of course, public policies is- But the right de- ter is the first n- of public policies

THE INDIVIDUAL THE PART

only through the- citizenship that t- be made to yield- British self-govern- ed through other- party system; but- it did not. It de- tem. The evils o- manifest. They v- cynical truth than- ed party the ma- benefit of the few- vidual citizens to- that in free coun- inevitable, if not- conducting publi- here to his party- with a firm and l- is the most bene- can do that no l- ence. It is in su- definition of part- of good governm- constantly growin-

That there is s- tics which disting- Eastern Canada- points of view- on the prairies d-

LAWYERS AND POLITICS.

iers are not law- the premier is a l- ier—as also the- Dominion Parli- This is not cited- crime and misde- the lawyers of hi- be "men bred fro- proving by words- white is black an- they are paid." S- a biting pen. His- profession is qu-