

"Yes. That's the crooked part of it. That's why I'm here, appealing to you, not as a prisoner to his judge, but as a man. Help me to get even with my mother-in-law!"

The colonel cogitated. "On principle I will—principle, mind, not as a personal favour to you."

"Thanks, colonel, a thousand times. Now to unravel. I am not distorting the facts when I say that one of the chief reasons why I accepted the Scream's offer to come here was my dislike of living any longer in the same house as my wife's mother. Heaven knows," he said, rather bitterly, "until I was married myself I always thought this mother-in-law stuff was only the feeble humour of the comic supplement—one of the seven original jokes handed down from before the flood! But I've found it wasn't."

"Even as you or I," quoted the colonel, softly.

"When I married my little Eva, I thought I saw the prospect of a real Eden opening before me! And so we did have an Eden, for six or seven months, until that old plague settled down on us. Since then, I've taken to drink and Lord knows what else, but no use—I can't dodge it. The way that woman runs my house! I've told Eva hundreds of times I won't stand it, and Eva says she won't stand it, either, and we both agree we won't stand it, and then the old dame comes in again after her walk, and in two minutes we're eating out of her hand! Does that bore you?"

"It's not surprisingly novel."

"No, you bet it isn't! I could go on for hours about her—but you know what it is. The long and the short of it is this. My late lamented Uncle Silas, whose sole legatee I was, took an inveterate dislike to my wife. I didn't mention, did I, that my little Eva used to be on the stage—musical plays, you know?"

"No, you didn't."

"The old fellow was one of the select men of the up-country church, and thought the stage was hell. So when I married Eva he was very wroth, and refused to see her. He didn't, however, cut me off with a nickel, because he was rather fond of me. But what did he do—the vindictive old cuss!—but to put a clause in his will to the effect that if I predeceased my wife all the money he left me was to

(Continued on page 18.)

World's Greatest Talkers

A Chicago Lawyer's Letter to a Canadian

JOHN M. ZANE in private life is a Chicago lawyer. He is also an American with a voice. At the annual dinner of the Chicago alumni of Michigan University, some time ago, John M. Zane made what he calls an impromptu speech on the war. He was the toastmaster and for a few moments he broke away from all ordinary decorum to say what he thought about the various countries fighting against Germany. The speech was casually sent to a friend in England, who promptly got it into the Westminster Gazette as a sample of what one American thinks about the war. From the Gazette it was copied into the Daily Mail and into several other papers throughout the Empire.

What John M. Zane said about the belligerent countries in that little speech, however, is not half so strong as the things he said afterwards in correspondence with Mr. Melville P. White, a friend of his in Toronto. After noting that he had three great-great-grandfathers in the Revolutionary War and two of the same ilk in the War of 1812, and therefore has some right to speak as an American, he goes on in his first letter to express his congratulation at the way Canada has gone to war. He eulogizes the way the British Navy has guaranteed the safety and liberty of the world outside of Europe.

In his second letter replying to Mr. White the Chicago lawyer came back again with a still stronger statement of what an American thinks about the war. This time he eliminated everything but what he thinks about the United States. What he says concerning the part that the greatest Republic in the world is not doing in a war of ideas is probably the strongest indictment of American so-called neutrality ever written by an American—and therefore by anybody. He says:

"It is true, as your correspondent says, that we are the greatest talkers in the world about freedom, and yet our Government, when free government wherever it exists is in peril from a people as thoroughly autocratic as the Prussians, says not a single word to show where we stand. It is surely nothing better than hypocrisy, or rather utter cowardice, for us to say that neutrality means a suppression of ideas that favor free government."

"But if we had looked at the war merely from the low standpoint of our selfish interests, leaving out of view the fundamental issue, we ought to have seen instantly that if Germany wins and England loses command of the ocean, Germany would at once give us a choice between a devastating war and the bitterest of humiliations. Even now, if the German warships could keep the sea, we would have no commerce of any sort. The wayfaring man, though a fool, ought to be able to see that result and to realize what a German victory means."

"Suppose that Germany were dominant over the earth, with her fixed idea that the German methods are the best in the world and must be made to prevail by 'blood and iron'; imagine Prussian corporals in To-

ronto, Melbourne, Bombay and Hong Kong dictating to people what to say or do; what would become of that easy intercourse and free dealing which makes the British Empire such an elevating force even in Egypt, India or Singapore? Suppose the great countries of the world vassals of the Teutons ready to impose with cruelty and oppression their forms of government everywhere, and we realize that this world would be unfit for any man to live in who was not born to be a slave.

"It was not long before this war began that a large German company was formed to buy up two provinces in Brazil. When it was suggested that our Monroe Doctrine would prevent vast German acquisitions in South America, the reply was that Germany had the power, the men and the guns to treat the United States with contempt. But when the German bankers asked what would be England's attitude, and were told that England would determine her course when the time came, the enterprise was abandoned. If it had not been for the English fleet, Germany would have ridden roughshod over our futile objections.

"In the light of such things it is strange to well-informed people everywhere that our Government made its initial and ignoble failure to voice the overwhelming sentiment in this country, and to make at least some protest over the violation of neutral rights in the brutal sacking of Belgium. It is equally strange that our dealings with the German embassy and its propaganda of disloyalty among us is so puerile and indulgent. It is stranger still that the national resentment for the piracy and murder in the case of the Lusitania, and now that of the Arabic, has been allowed to decline into a flabby exchange of meaningless assurances.

"But worst of all is our apparent willingness to be used as a German tool in protesting against the most efficient blockade known in warfare. There is no doubt that certain large mercantile interests among us desire fraudulently to circumvent the blockade and reap rich rewards by shipping to neutral ports, whence the goods will go directly to Germany and its army. Behind this movement is German money and the German embassy. If England and her merchants during our civil war had tried to consign unprecedented quantities of goods to Mexico, there to be reshipped to the South, our protest against such a palpable evasion would have been well justified. Yet our Government seems now to insist that it is our duty to claim that Denmark and Sweden have the right to be called neutral ports for the reshipping of contraband to Germany. And this too when the English blockade is built upon our own doctrines and our own judicial decisions.

"It is certainly no wonder that while we already had the active hatred of Germany, we have now earned by our hypocrisy the contempt of the Allies. If you ask me why this is so, all I can say is that we are ruled by the pettiest set of weak-kneed politicians that ever cursed any country. They find their support in that large, indolent, craven mass of ignorant and weak, but often well-meaning, people, whose only idea is to submit to outrage in order that an outrage may be repeated. This large mass is supported by the infuriated, unassimilated band of traitorous Germans who are willing to live under a free government, while being at heart Hunnish slaves.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. ZANE.

RUSHING TO THE AID OF SERBIA



The Courier is proud of its photographic service. These genuine pictures of Allied troops at Salonika have been rushed through without delay. Here the French Infantry are marching to their camp, with a Greek band on the right playing native airs.



Already two British Divisions (40,000 men) have gone forward from Salonika to the aid of the sorely pressed Serbian armies. This picture was taken just outside Salonika, where the Allies have a big camp.