

The Sun

MONDAY, JUNE 1, 1914.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid. DAILY, Per Month, \$0.50. DAILY, Per Year, \$5.00.

THE EVENING SUN, Per Month, \$0.25. THE EVENING SUN, Per Year, \$2.50.

Readers of THE SUN leaving town for the summer months can have the daily and Sunday and evening editions delivered to them in any part of this country or Europe on the terms stated above.

All checks, money orders, &c., to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published daily, including Sunday, by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.

London office, Edinborough House, 1 Arundel street, Strand.

Paris office, 6 Rue de la Michodiere, on Rue de Quatre Septembre.

Washington office, Hibbs Building.

Brooklyn office, 156 Livingston street.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts and illustrations for publication wish to have rejected articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Mr. Wilson on Moral Courage.

In his Memorial Day address Mr. Wilson distinguished nobility from greatness and physical from moral courage. The noble men, "with a splendid surplus of courage to spend upon their fellow men," the members of "the House of Fame," are they who, "forgetful of themselves, study and serve the public interest, who have the courage to face any number and any kind of adversity, to speak what in their hearts they believe to be the truth."

And therein is "service," and thereby "the freedom of the human spirit." The Horatian righteous man, steadfast of purpose, may be adorned with a more precious and a gentler charm in Mr. Wilson's theme, but the persistent moral courage, the unshakable firmness, the will and power to face a world in arms, the contempt of consequences, the eye single to the truth, are finely painted and finely soiled.

Fortunately, the living example of this high Roman fashion is not lacking. When confronted by combinations of laborers and farmers, who demand to be put above the law made for the rest of us, and who threaten the just and tenacious man if he doesn't accept the exemption they seek to impose, does he yield, does he weaken? No, he draws on his splendid surplus of moral courage. He signs as directed, but he memorandums: "Merely an opinion of Congress."

This moral backbone stood up and out above the acceptance last June of the sundry civil bill, with its immunity, so far as the appropriation carried in it for trust law enforcement, of labor and farmers' organizations from prosecution. This June the Hon. SAMUEL GOMPERS has ready for him a more sweeping and absolute statute of privileges and immunities inserted in the Clayton anti-trust bill. Another, a nobler opportunity for moral courage tempered by the memorandum.

Mr. Kipling's Frenzy.

That extravagance of speech which is supposed to be an Irish characteristic has been all on the other side in the later stages of the home rule discussion. Unionist enthusiasts—not, of course, the real party leaders—have waded in verbal gore and having killed and eaten their foes consigned their names to eternities of infamy. It has become the fashion in certain London weekly and monthly publications to speak of the recent Curragh incident, the tentative arrangement for sending troops to keep order in Ulster, as "the Pogrom," and if the historian of 4014 finds only tattered shreds of these lucubrations he will be apt to record that the Asquith Ministry perpetrated a wholesale massacre of Orangemen.

Newspapers just received from London bring lamentable proof that one of the worst victims of the prevailing frenzy is Mr. RUDYARD KIPLING. He has caught the Ulster fever in its most malignant form. Not merely have judgment, logic and eye for proportion departed temporarily from him; he has even lost his sense of humor. Never has the comic Irishman of his own or any other imagination indulged in such grotesque superlatives. And, sad to say, Mr. Kipling speaks in tragic earnestness of spirit, while the blustering Celt, it is pretty well admitted, has generally a good humored notion of his own absurdity hidden somewhere under his superficial passion.

Mr. Kipling made a speech at Tumbidge Wells on May 16 wherein he gave free rein to his imagination and his adjectives. The home rule bill, he said, had only one object; it was to put £100,000 in the pockets of the Cabinet—the "Crooked Cabinet," he called it. This was the object of the Parliament bill, and of all recent policies of the Asquith administration, which is made up of poor men. Parliament was bribed with £100 a year salaries to keep the Cabinet in for five years so that the members might enrich themselves.

So far the country had only been "openly degraded in the eyes of all nations that set any store by the purity of their justice or the personal honor

of their administration." But the worst was yet to come. Being short of a majority in the Commons the Government bought the Irish vote. In admirable forgetfulness of the Parliamentary history of the last twenty-five years Mr. Kipling comments thus:

"The home rule bill broke the faith of generations. It officially recognized sedition, privy conspiracy and rebellion. It subsidized the secret forces of boycott, intimidation, outrage and murder. It created an independent stronghold in which all these forces could work together, as they have always and openly boasted that they would work, for the destruction of Great Britain."

Of course Mr. Kipling does not blame the Irish Nationalists. He is most generous to them. Being Irish Nationalists they couldn't help being original sinners, so how could he say anything really severe? He merely points out a few unpleasant things about them as they figure in his mind's eye. Here are a few choice examples of his moderation:

"They are what they are. They are what their particular type of their race has always been since the beginning of recorded history."

"They have imposed their own ancient form of tribal administration on large tracts of Ireland—a despotism of secret societies, a government of denunciation by day and terrorism by night."

"They have never faltered in their passionate and persistent hatred of England. They have preached it and practised it by every means in their power."

"They have prayed for the success of England's enemies in every quarter of the world. They have assisted those enemies with men and with arms."

"They have jeered at England's defeats. They have defouled the honor of England's army, and they have mocked England's dead."

"It was to men with this record of crime that the Cabinet prepared to hand over a portion of our United Kingdom, for no other reason than that they might continue in enjoyment of their office."

But nothing, Mr. Kipling opines, is impossible in a land without a constitution; of course Britain's venerated charter went to the "demonition bow-works" when the Parliament bill was passed. So after the surrender to the home rulers the Government proceeded to martyrize Ulster. "We may believe," says the orator, "that President HUERTA would not sell a province of Mexico to the United States. We have no right to believe that of England. Why are we here today? Why, indeed? Seeing that "we are forbidden to have any voice in this sale of our own flesh and blood." The Government was resolved on massacre:

"So they proposed to put Ulster out of the way. With this object they secretly prepared the largest combined expedition of both arms that has been launched since the Crimea—a force of horse, foot, field guns, howitzers, battleships, cruisers and destroyers. If those Ulster cattle could not be sold on the hoof they should be delivered as carcasses."

But "it takes nerve to organize such a cattle killing" and a slip was made. The Curragh incident followed and the saintlike devotion of the army officers defeated the "conspiracy." This was the result:

"These men, who met to arrange massacre, these men who would bombard an open town of loyal subjects sooner than risk the loss of thirteen guineas a day while they asked the electors to leave to do so—these outlaws were still his Majesty's Ministers, powerful heads of great departments of State. They could make or break the careers of honorable men. The officers took their choice of the alternatives so brutally presented to them. They elected to forfeit their pay and position rather than do this work to save the pay and position of his Majesty's Ministers. By their choice—to their eternal honor and glory be it recorded—the army saved the empire. What has happened since? The Cabinet and the House of Commons have drawn eight weeks more salary."

In his climax Mr. Kipling declared that if the Government did not retreat at once civil war was inevitable. "The history of the land shows that there is but one end—destruction from within or destruction from without." Since this delightful speech was spent on the air the home rule bill has passed the Commons. So far there is not the slightest sign of civil war. On the contrary, there is every indication that the Unionists are preparing to get any concession they can from Mr. ASQUITH and then make the most of the situation peacefully in the next general election. Not unlikely the best guarantee that there will be no civil war is the release of froth and fury that has been effected through the vocabularies of uninspired prophets in the course of the long and exasperating struggle.

Taking Chances.

The captain of the Storsdal had no intention whatever of doing mischief. The idea of causing the loss of even a single life would have been abhorrent to him. Further, the last thing in the world he would have thought of was the damaging of his own vessel.

But when a risk came his way he decided to take it. The Storsdal and the Empress of Ireland were in sight of each other for some time. That there was a risk perceptible to seamanship is proved by the exchange of signals. The commander of the bigger vessel saw it so clearly that he took extreme precautions. He stopped his ship and kept on signalling.

Why could not the captain of the Storsdal view the situation in the same way? Why did he not come to a dead stop? Or why did he not sheer off on a course that would have taken him far from the Empress of Ireland?

Once More on the Boards.

From the official announcement of the Pennsylvania Chautauque Association it is apparent that the season of 1914 will be not less notable than its predecessors. The Tyrolean yodlers have been induced to sign for another series of appearances, the famous quartets that excite so much enthusiasm

are reported to be in excellent voice, the Secretary of State has once more affixed his signature to a contract and the bandmasters have recruited their corps of musicians to full strength. July 4 and North Carolina will see the opening performance, and from that day until fall the tents will be jammed with earnest seekers after instruction modified by judicious quantities of entertainment.

What the Secretary of State will speak on has not yet been divulged. He will select his own subject, and treat it in his own way. Naturally, many persons are curious as to what his message of 1914 will be. While THE SUN has at present no information in regard to the Secretary's plans, its knowledge of his character emboldens it to brand as false and malicious the report that the Secretary has chosen as the title for his utterance "How to Win a Nobel Prize."

To All Right Minded People.

Colonel ROOSEVELT's farewell address before he took charge of the Atlantic Ocean for a few days, as a favor to Admiral NEPTUNE, contains just about enough to keep the brethren guessing and wondering until he returns and all hands begin to play. It is prudent, provisional, an interim filler, a curiosity raiser; just what its deep revealing author meant it should be. Its temperature is moderate and of early summer.

It would be premature to ponder too seriously this preliminary notice of intention. The Colonel is waiting on events. If they are not satisfactory, if they don't turn up as per his schedule, there will be seas of trouble.

Meanwhile it is the duty of all right minded people to agree with the Colonel, at present the Admiral, that "the two boss" system is a sin and a shame as well as played out. This State and this country need and can't get along without just one boss. Temporary mail address: Madrid.

Tom Is In Again.

Following the usual course of law-breakers, TOM OSBORNE finds himself in Auburn Prison for a second term, and one considerably longer than his first. How soon he will be let out nobody knows. That he is under lock and key once more is, however, a source of unfeigned regret to his friends.

It must be apparent that if OSBORNE cannot keep clear of prisons he will soon become the cause of considerable expense to the State. Already, it is asserted, he has become so familiar to the legal population of Auburn that he is known by a nickname as familiar as it is undignified. Thus the progress of a sociologist among criminals is generally marked. So much for the personal aspect of the curious case of TOM OSBORNE.

Of the public bearing of this strange incident what shall be said? What, indeed, except that there is not any particular reason why the taxpayers should support TOM OSBORNE in Auburn Prison?

The statesman who hesitates is lost.

Is the one boss system in political life preferable to the two boss system which is said on eminent authority to prevail in this State? Or does it depend on who is boss?

Nobody will grudge the children the romp they had in the parks Saturday. It is no small thing that the city was able to bestow a day of pleasure upon 35,000 of its growing citizens and citizens. But it is a question whether the same result could not be reached at less cost in the way of devastation to the public pleasure grounds. Those who saw Central Park late Saturday afternoon when the fun was over say that its despoilment was pitiful. The trampled grass and the wide flung litter were inevitable conditions of the passage of 35,000 children, but they forcibly present the question whether the children might not have been better accommodated in some of the big parks beyond the Harlem. As practically every child had to pay carfare and as the rate to Bronx and Van Cortlandt parks is no greater than to Central, would it not be better in future years to transfer all the romping to these ample spaces? Besides, as a fresh air investment, five cents spent on going to the big outlying parks is even better than a trip to the street bound Central garden plot.

Workaholic has his day—Headline.

The devil wagon can still spare him one out of the three hundred and sixty-five.

Though only 700 veterans of the great civil strife may now be able to face the sun and dust and tread the wearisome pavements to inspire their grandchildren with patriotic ardor, they are not the only figures in the public eye on Memorial Day. The souls of those who have passed the boundaries of time go marching on, and the garlands of a people's gratitude decorate the shrines in which their memories are held sacred.

In an article in the Cavalry Journal for May Lieutenant BRUCE P. DISQUE, who witnessed the battle of Nuevo Laredo in January, praises the bravery and coolness of the combatants on both sides. He declares that "no one who saw this affair" could have any doubt of the soldierly qualities of the Mexicans. There was, for instance, the Federal officer who with a small detachment rode out from his lines to reconnoitre and had his horse shot under him; disengaging himself from the stirrups he walked slowly back to the Federal position puffing a cigarette as he went, although little clouds of dust showed that bullets were striking the earth all about him.

An insurgent rapid fire gun caught Lieutenant DISQUE's eye. It was in the open and one man was working the gun. After firing several rounds he would rise and walk about the piece, although the Federals were trying to "get" him. They succeeded and he went down. Instantly another insurgent sprang from cover to take his place. This man lasted five minutes, when a third man walked out to the gun, which with great deliberation he moved fifty yards to the right before opening fire.

Lieutenant DISQUE says that the combatants on both sides showed the same indifference to danger and the same sangfroid; with one exception, a Federal soldier, who was seen making his

way to the river to desert, only to be riddled with bullets by his own comrades. Nuevo Laredo was a battle in which neither side expected quarter, which made the loyalty and valour of the men all the more notable. It has been the fashion in the United States to regard the Mexican as poor material for a soldier, but it appears from Lieutenant DISQUE's narrative that although the Mexican may fight unscientifically he fights stolidly and is not afraid to die. Also he mutes his wounds with an Indian's fortitude.

Old fashioned the methods of the Terrytown police may be in dealing with disturbers of the peace, but there is something attractive about them. The plan of letting one I. W. W. orator after another just go far enough to break the ordinance and then corks him up in a cell is both careful and practical. There is a certain patient thoroughness about the proceeding which belongs to the higher order of efficiency. There is an admirable irony, too, in the plight of BUCKY EMBLESON, still talking in a solitary stone jug, without eyes or ears to see or hear her.

STEAMSHIP DISASTERS.

New Measures to Prevent Collisions Should Be Taken.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: The world must soon realize that no ship, however protected by transverse bulkheads or even by the new "double hull," can withstand the terrific effect of a collision with another swiftly moving giant vessel. The new double hull is yet to be tested in an open sea, and it is not clear that particular type are "unsinkable," but was not the same thing said of the Titanic? Can any invention of man prevent the huge masses of iron and steel? Undoubtedly the double hull would help in time of collision, but it could not wholly prevent the awful toll of life from being exacted. Further steps to prevent collisions should be taken.

We read that "the colliders have no underwater telephonic signals and their approach cannot be detected by wireless liners." Of what use is the submarine equipment of the Empress of Ireland and other liners if it affords no protection against the danger of collision with a vessel with less caution in all kinds of weather? Freighters should be compelled by law to carry this submarine apparatus, not only for their own safety, but for the safety of the great liners freighted with human beings.

In almost every disaster of this type we read that "the ship listed so heavily to port that the lifeboats on the starboard side could not be launched." Surely the boat builders and owners know that the boat will list in this manner if one side is crumpled? They cannot be used in time of disaster? Does the Board of Trade think that by loading a ship with lifeboats that can only be lowered when the ship is already on her side the shipowners and the board have done their duty to the passengers?

"After the first shock the vessel was enveloped in a dense fog and the lights of this kind. Electric light is a treacherous friend to passengers in steamship disasters, for it is usually extinguished by the impact. An auxiliary electric lighting system with current supplied from a battery of storage cells, or a battery supplied with gas from small tanks, would save many lives by preventing panic and making it possible to fill the boats with people and launch them after the vessel has been wrecked. The government investigators will decide after much deliberation that the accident was "unavoidable" instead of fastening the blame upon some of the other circumstances, unless of course criminal negligence or carelessness is clearly proven.

RICHARD HOWLAND.

NEW YORK, May 31.

"KICKERS" AND REFORMERS.

They Are Essentially Homologous and Differ but Slightly.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: THE SUN contains an analysis of the views of its correspondents maintain by implication that "kickers" and reformers may not be classified for the purposes of a political party, but they are essentially homologous. The typical "kicker" is inspired by a keen sense of justice, or more precisely the infringement thereof. So is the reformer. The "kicker" gives vent to his indignation by constant railing to promote the reformation of the manners and customs of others in conformity with his own notions of what manners and customs should be. So does the reformer.

The "kicker" undertakes the remedy of whatever abuse he may encounter while engaged upon his own affairs. The reformer undertakes the remedy of whatever abuse which engaged upon the affairs of others in the consecrated pursuit of it. No other distinction of importance exists between them.

A reformer simply defined is a "kicker" become less disinterested, diversionist and diverting, more egotistical, more egotistic and more egotistical.

If I have been in error in assuming this discussion to partake of the usual unadvised character of the remarks of some of the correspondents, including the "kickers" and reformers, I am, of course, very sorry.

FRED METCALFE.

PLAINFIELD, N. J., May 30.

Economic Aspects of Moral Grandeur.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: I cannot help wondering at times if the moral grandeur of our President and of certain of our statesmen is of great value. If it is, how are their salaries affected thereby in anything like the degree that are the revenues of the unhappy non-officials.

NEW YORK, May 31.

And the Pig Did Not Cut Its Throat.

From the Berkshire Courier. A hog got away from its pen and came out of Paul & Co.'s stable yard. Half a hundred small boys and girls were speedily chasing it and the hog ran down Church street and across laws and through doorways to Bridge street, down toward the Barrington Mills.

Then it took to the water and swam the river to the opposite bank. There it was headed by the children and two men who had been trying to catch it, and not long had the hog was again swimming the river. It was finally roped by one of the men.

Couffer to the Temple.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Can M. D. Sims, hair dresser of Jersey City, burn his name with tongs on the tablet of fame? SIMMS, N. J., May 29.

Anatomical Note From the Public Library.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Oh, what a foot on the lady on the southeast corner of the Public Library! J. C. ABERN.

NEW YORK, May 29.

Impressionist Verse.

In the new poetry there is no rhyme, but a good deal of reason—Felicite Moore. The other with riverlike fallings. You can't suppress him! LA TORRES MARCONI.

A QUESTION OF TREATY INTERPRETATION.

Respectful Application to Ex-President Taft for an Opinion.

To the Hon. William H. Taft, Yale University.

DEAR SIR: I think it lies within your power to be of much service to your country, and to do so with so few as perhaps a dozen words.

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty says that the canal shall be open to the vessels of "all nations" with "no discrimination" in respect of conditions or charges of traffic, and that the charges of traffic shall be "just and equitable."

"All nations." Do these words mean simply that, or do they mean "all nations but the United States?" This question has been asked many times. It has been answered in both ways. I think, though I am by no means sure, that it has never been asked quite in the concrete. I mean it has never been put in such form as to make one's nose about it fall into the concrete. No one man in ten thousand is capable of thinking in the abstract. It is in the hope that you may answer the question in the concrete that I am venturing to address you. A few words from you, either one way or the other, would be useful; for people not only esteem you, but what is a dozen times more so, they are a dozen times more practical than they look.

It is well known that the men who were entrusted by the two nations with the drawing of this contract realized the value of each word that entered into it. In the shaping of it a single word might count for billions of money in favor of or against the nation that consented to the contract, and that particular word. Competition in trade through the canal will be very, very keen. And they well knew it.

By this treaty there was given to the United States the right to fix the charges of traffic. The right so given had two limitations put upon it. The charges must be "just and equitable." And there must be "no discrimination." Now this phrase "no discrimination"—what did it mean? No discrimination as between whom and whom?

Perhaps because this question has been left pretty much in the abstract, the reason why it has been answered in two ways. Suffer me to put it in the concrete and ask an answer in the concrete.

Nations in the abstract cannot be gainers, nor can they be losers, by one answer or by the other. But actual nations, nations that we place upon the map, may be gaining, or may be suffering, according as the contract shall be interpreted.

Here, for example, are the British, the Germans, the Norwegians. First take the two latter. If any discrimination is made by us between the Germans and the Norwegians, so that the Norwegians get through at a lower rate than the Germans, the result may be, and doubtless will be, that the German ships will be driven from that route and thus will miss the share of the rich traffic of the region to which the canal is a shortcut. Precisely the same result would be the result of discriminating against the British.

Now what we do not yet see clearly, and what your opinion will perhaps help us to see clearly, is this, namely, whether in holding out for that word "all" the British had any thought that the word might protect their trade as against the Americans by preventing us from destroying it through discrimination against them and in our own favor in letting our own ships through at a lower charge than we made to British ships. It is true this case is different from the two other cases. The first case concerned two nations neither of which was a party to the contract. The second case concerned two nations, one of which, the British, was a party to the contract, the other being the German nation. The third case concerns the two parties to the contract, the British and the Americans. Is this difference, the circumstance that the parties were binding each with regard to conduct toward the other, and the treaty was meant to be their last say. Neither the Germans nor the Norwegians, indeed, were parties to the contract. But the thing would be so vital against the trade of the Germans if we should favor the Norwegians that both of us saw it necessary to protect them as thoroughly as if they had been parties to the contract and thereby in position to protect themselves. In point of fact, as the treaty is worded, the word "all" now protects the Germans without once mentioning them, because "all" certainly covers the Germans.

It is possible the British were not altogether unselfish in insisting upon the word "all." They have a great trade in those regions, greater, I suppose, than the whole of the other nations put together. They knew that if we, to whom they were now yielding up the right to protect their trade, were to discriminate in favor of the Germans as against the British, by letting the Germans pass at a lower charge than the British, then the British would in a little while be driven off that route by the Germans, precisely as would be the case by the Norwegians. But the case between the British and the Germans would be different from that between the Germans and the Norwegians, because the British, the nation whose trade would be ruined, is itself one of the parties to the contract; neither the Germans nor the Norwegians are parties. However, the principle in the two cases is the same principle. Justice required that there be "no discrimination." The reason why discrimination would be unjust and therefore was forbidden in the effect to be produced by discrimination. The nation discriminated against would probably lose a trade of great value. Here it was said to decry the value of the word "all." Because this word takes in everybody, it would mean the Germans, although it did not mention them. It would mean the British, although the British would be protected in their trade as against the Germans. This is why the British insisted upon "all." The British, one of the two parties to the contract, felt they had a right to bind the other party to protect the British as against the Germans, who, not even being parties to the contract, would be except for that little word "all" be able to come in and drive the great British trade quite off that profitable route. The Germans would accord us some favor, and in return for it we would by discriminating do them the favor of letting them drive off the British.

What now is to be said about discrimination in favor of the Americans? As many persons have noted, this is quite a different question. For, first, the Americans are the builders. They own the canal. Will any man stand up and say openly that the Americans have not the right to fix the charges for American vessels upon their own canal? How can the canal be really theirs if they cannot fix the charges upon it for their own vessels? Would it not seem clear enough to men of honest meaning that when the treaty says that as between "all nations" there shall be "no discrimination," this means "all nations but the Americans, who built the canal, who are the owners of it and who do not need any authorization to fix the charges of traffic upon their own vessels?" Would it not seem clear enough to men of honest meaning that when the treaty says that as between "all nations" there shall be "no discrimination," this means "all nations but the Americans, who built the canal, who are the owners of it and who do not need any authorization to fix the charges of traffic upon their own vessels?"

There is another thing which perhaps ought at any rate to be considered. I say ought to be considered. It is in order that we may consider it with the help of your light, whatever your views may be, and with the help of your warm love for justice which will give its own solvent energy, that I am asking your opinion.

We have seen that in finding words for this treaty each party would be struggling for each word that might insure to it a full protection. Each party beat its brains, if I may say so, to find the words that would best protect it if the other party would permit them to be used. The British found that the word "all" would protect the Germans against the Norwegians, and we found we had no objection. Protection to the Germans was a kind of protection to the British and to the Americans as well. All nations, perhaps, desire sometimes fairness, but at all times assuredly a reputation for fairness, respectively of whether they deserve it. Such a reputation may at some time prove an advantage, prove some protection to the nation that has the reputation. So the Americans and the British both insisted upon the word "all," for by the use of that word the Germans would be protected against the Norwegians. This would be generous to the Germans, and these nations were party to the contract.

Besides this, the British saw that the word "all" would protect themselves, the British, against the Germans. With this word in the treaty the Germans would never be able to run the British off that route. Here was a much more important use for the word "all." Here the word would serve, and with complete directness, the interests of one of the parties to the contract, the British, for protection against the Germans, the Germans not being parties to the contract. Here it was an advantage to be one of the parties to the contract.

Is it now possible—I put this question in no very vague or general fashion, and yet, I ask, that in the drawing up of this contract between the British and the Americans both parties to the engagement had in mind a third species of protection which we have not yet considered?

We see that the British held out for the word "all" because "all" would protect the Germans against the Norwegians, neither of whom were parties to the contract. And the Americans consented.

We see that the British held out for the word "all" for the further reason that "all" would protect the British, one of the parties to the contract, against the Germans, who were not parties to it, but against whom the British desired, and not without reason, to protect their trade in respect of the destruction which we might bring about by discriminating in favor of the Germans as against the British. And the Americans consented.

your views may be, and with the help of your warm love for justice which will give its own solvent energy, that I am asking your opinion.

We have seen that in finding words for this treaty each party would be struggling for each word that might insure to it a full protection. Each party beat its brains, if I may say so, to find the words that would best protect it if the other party would permit them to be used. The British found that the word "all" would protect the Germans against the Norwegians, and we found we had no objection. Protection to the Germans was a kind of protection to the British and to the Americans as well. All nations, perhaps, desire sometimes fairness, but at all times assuredly a reputation for fairness, respectively of whether they deserve it. Such a reputation may at some time prove an advantage, prove some protection to the nation that has the reputation. So the Americans and the British both insisted upon the word "all," for by the use of that word the Germans would be protected against the Norwegians. This would be generous to the Germans, and these nations were party to the contract.

Besides this, the British saw that the word "all" would protect themselves, the British, against the Germans. With this word in the treaty the Germans would never be able to run the British off that route. Here was a much more important use for the word "all." Here the word would serve, and with complete directness, the interests of one of the parties to the contract, the British, for protection against the Germans, the Germans not being parties to the contract. Here it was an advantage to be one of the parties to the contract.

Is it now possible—I put this question in no very vague or general fashion, and yet, I ask, that in the drawing up of this contract between the British and the Americans both parties to the engagement had in mind a third species of protection which we have not yet considered?

We see that the British held out for the word "all" because "all" would protect the Germans against the Norwegians, neither of whom were parties to the contract. And the Americans consented.

We see that the British held out for the word "all" for the further reason that "all" would protect the British, one of the parties to the contract, against the Germans, who were not parties to it, but against whom the British desired, and not without reason, to protect their trade in respect of the destruction which we might bring about by discriminating in favor of the Germans as against the British. And the Americans consented.

Now what we do not yet see clearly, and what your opinion will perhaps help us to see clearly, is this, namely, whether in holding out for that word "all" the British had any thought that the word might protect their trade as against the Americans by preventing us from destroying it through discrimination against them and in our own favor in letting our own ships through at a lower charge than we made to British ships. It is true this case is different from the two other cases. The first case concerned two nations neither of which was a party to the contract. The second case concerned two nations, one of which, the British, was a party to the contract, the other being the German nation. The third case concerns the two parties to the contract, the British and the Americans. Is this difference, the circumstance that the parties were binding each with regard to conduct toward the other, and the treaty was meant to be their last say. Neither the Germans nor the Norwegians, indeed, were parties to the contract. But the thing would be so vital against the trade of the Germans if we should favor the Norwegians that both of us saw it necessary to protect them as thoroughly as if they had been parties to the contract and thereby in position to protect themselves. In point of fact, as the treaty is worded, the word "all" now protects the Germans without once mentioning them, because "all" certainly covers the Germans.

It is possible the British were not altogether unselfish in insisting upon the word "all." They have a great trade in those regions, greater, I suppose, than the whole of the other nations put together. They knew that if we, to whom they were now yielding up the right to protect their trade, were to discriminate in favor of the Germans as against the British, by letting the Germans pass at a lower charge than the British, then the British would in a little while be driven off that route by the Germans, precisely as would be the case by the Norwegians. But the case between the British and the Germans would be different from that between the Germans and the Norwegians, because the British, the nation whose trade would be ruined, is itself one of the parties to the contract; neither the Germans nor the Norwegians are parties. However, the principle in the two cases is the same principle. Justice required that there be "no discrimination." The reason why discrimination would be unjust and therefore was forbidden in the effect to be produced by discrimination. The nation discriminated against would probably lose a trade of great value. Here it was said to decry the value of the word "all." Because this word takes in everybody, it would mean the Germans, although it did not mention them. It would mean the British, although the British would be protected in their trade as against the Germans. This is why the British insisted upon "all." The British, one of the two parties to the contract, felt they had a right to bind the other party to protect the British as against the Germans, who, not even being parties to the contract, would be except for that little word "all" be able to come in and drive the great British trade quite off that profitable route. The Germans would accord us some favor, and in return for it we would by discriminating do them the favor of letting them drive off the British.

What now is to be said about discrimination in favor of the Americans? As many persons have noted, this is quite a different question. For, first, the Americans are the builders. They own the canal. Will any man stand up and say openly that the