

**ILLUSTRATED**  
**Evening Ledger**  
**PUBLIC LEDGER COMPANY**  
CHRIS H. K. CURTIS, President  
Charles H. Laddington, Vice President, John J. ...  
EDITORIAL BOARD:  
CHRIS H. K. CURTIS, Chairman  
F. H. WHALEY, Editor  
PHILIP C. MARTIN, General Business Manager  
Published daily at Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia.  
Subscription Terms:  
The Evening Ledger is served to subscribers in Philadelphia and surrounding towns at the rate of twelve (12) cents per week, payable in advance.  
To all foreign countries one (\$1) dollar per month.  
Notice—Subscribers wishing address changed must give old as well as new address.  
BELL, 3000 WALNUT KEYSTONE, MAIN 3000  
Address all communications to Evening Ledger, Independence Square, Philadelphia.  
ENTERED AT THE PHILADELPHIA POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MAIL MATTER  
Philadelphia, Monday, November 5, 1917

**Y. M. C. A. IS 'HOME' FOR THE SOLDIERS**  
Organization's Work Goes From Cantonments to the Firing Line  
By FRANKLYN R. G. FOX  
UNQUESTIONABLY one of the most notable features of the great war is the work of the Young Men's Christian Association. All the Allied Governments, the Vatican, army officers and soldiers, diplomats and clergymen of all denominations have welcomed the association as a godsend in this terrific age of bloodshed.  
The association has become the very life of our army cantonments, and today is playing an all-important and vitally essential part in military training and morale.  
Far from being "slackers," the Y. M. C. A. field secretaries should be commissioned officers. They are officers in every sense of the word. They are risking their lives daily on European battlefields. Several already have been killed. One, at least, has received the British military medal for bravery in action. And in our own army cantonments more than 2000 of these upright and courageous young men are looked to daily by American soldiers for advice, courage and assistance.  
Prominent and public-spirited Philadelphians are intensely aroused over a criticism expressed by Mr. Roosevelt that the Y. M. C. A. workers are "slackers." They feel the Colonel's only excuse is that he "erred because not informed of existing conditions." That any one should so have misinformed him is considered unardonable. Of course, many persons who are behind the times still think the Y. M. C. A. nothing more than a prayer-meeting organization. It is high time that some of the following truths should sink home and sink deep.  
If your son, brother or sweetheart in the American army is captured by the Germans, the Young Men's Christian Association is the only existing agency by which you will be able to communicate with him. The association's official correspondence in Berlin—the American citizen—is the only American officially recognized by the German Government. He still is at his post. The Y. M. C. A. has established small universities in all the prisoners' camps. It is helping mightily to teach and cheer the men. It is feeding the soldiers in the trenches. They live on bread, and the Y. M. C. A. has brought a real atmosphere of home to the "Sammyes" in France and to our own boys in the army cantonments.

**Tom Daly's Column**  
**THE DEVIL'S ACCENT**  
*I'm just a common sinner, do, like you— Unless you chance to be a bloomin' saint— And maybe what I've got to tell is new And maybe, on the other hand, it ain't. If teth a certain person you're acquainted And chat with him as I do, you'll allow, When you hear the conversation Meant to lead you to temptation, That the Devil has a German accent now.*  
Remember when he whiskered in your car Before this derved disturbance came along, He talked in simple English, plain and clear, And sang a very pleasant kind of song, And lately you have noticed something wrong; You really can't explain it, why or how, But you notice when you listen, To those oily words of his'n That the Devil has a German accent now.  
Of late he has been busy, much too much, Where talk in purest English isn't spoke; For several years he's put himself in Dutch And therefore he is "out" with decent folk. I never thought good cats would hurt a bloke, But when I am too hungry for my "chow," I observe in each temptation To ignore Food Conservation That the Devil has a German accent now.  
It's funny, too, I never used to think That shirking of a duty was a sin, And when I saw the Devil smile and wink I never was the man, I should have been. But now a ray of light is breaking in; I'm marching on my way with lifted brow; I'm determined not to listen To those oily words of his'n For the Devil has a German accent now!

**THE ORGANIZATION EULOGIZED**  
To the Editor of the Evening Ledger:  
Sir—In speaking to my fellow citizens of the coming election I wish to say that I have been a voter for more than fifty years, a Republican in politics of the Abraham Lincoln type, who believes in reform not only in the Republican and Democratic parties, but in church and social life as well. Most earnestly do I advise our citizens to consider well before they rush off into an abyss they are not now conscious of. It is my prayer that the reform should take place inside our organizations—why rush outside when we have such men of the John M. Patterson and George Wharton Pepper type, not a few, but many. It is true that "those whom the gods would destroy they first make mad"—so without knowing the why or wherefore I call upon the two candidates for Governor, Penrose and McPherson, and the other three brothers to get together. "In union there is strength."  
It is rather amusing to see Senator Penrose against his party. In what respect Mr. Nicholson (good as he may be) qualifies fitting him to be City Treasurer over Frederick J. Shoyer, who has been known many years and with a name beyond reproach? Just this afternoon I learned from one of his Sunday school scholars that he is clean in his habits, a total abstainer, does not use tobacco, pure in his life and a husband, father and citizen that any young man should be glad to follow in his footsteps. What has Governor Walter Smith's ability over my friend James B. Sheehan for Register of Wills? The only claim against the latter is as to money. If he is entitled to it by law, let him have it. Repeat the law, but don't blame the man who sheehan while Assistant Director of Public Safety did so much for me, or I should say for assisting in the discharge of my duties of Correction. In what respect will Mr. Armstrong make a better Receiver of Taxes than the present one, Mr. Kendrick? He is better than the best. So I beg my fellow citizens to shoulder and give these three Sheehan, Shoyer, and Kendrick, one of our old-time to routing majorities. Do not imagine they are any more murderers than I, and I trust I am not one, but on the contrary, am in favor of pure politics and pure politicians and in favor of reform inside our party lines. DAVID L. WITMER, Philadelphia, November 2.

**What Do You Know?**  
**QUIZ**  
1. In what part of Russia is Finland and the rest of what country did Russia obtain this territory?  
2. Who is Frederick Macmonnies?  
3. The Germans have captured about 100,000 Italians. About what percentage of the food of our army does that number represent?  
4. The British have captured Beerleba. Where is it?  
5. Where is Jamaica?  
6. Mr. Hillquit, who was born in Russia, was elected as "our next President" by a Catholic following. Why could he not have become President?  
7. Give another name for soft coal.  
8. Explain the old saying, "Do not put your eggs into one basket."  
9. What is the importance of Ostend now, and what was it distinguished for before the war?  
10. Who are the Moravians?  
**Answers to Saturday's Quiz**  
1. Count von Hertling, Michael's successor as German Chancellor.  
2. Pompey contested the leadership of the Roman domain with Julius Caesar.  
3. Fascinelli or Fascinelli.  
4. Sir Arthur Sullivan was a British composer who, with Sir William Gilbert and Sullivan, wrote "Pinafore," "Patience," etc.  
5. Stockholm is the capital of Sweden, and now forms the line between the sea and the land.  
6. Orlando, the new Premier of Italy.  
7. Dr. Karl Muck, conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra.  
8. "Weld's Disestablishment," the movement for the disestablishment of the Church of England which has long been an issue in English politics.  
9. Table salt is, chemically, sodium chloride.

**RECLAIMING BILLIONS**  
WELL-ADVANCED plans for the reclamation of some 25,000 acres of swamp land in Lowndes County, Ala., are announced by the corresponding of the Manufacturers' Record, who adds that "as this is already a very important cotton, corn and general produce farming section, as well as the second largest catfish and hog producing county in Alabama, the new enterprise takes on a semblance of national importance."  
Every successful project of this kind is of national importance because of its contribution to the country's wealth and power. The South has approximately 50,000,000 acres of wet lands, which in their present condition are virtually useless and in numerous instances a menace to health, but which if properly drained would provide farm sites of unsurpassed fertility. These lands are now worth only a few dollars an acre—not more than \$10 at the most liberal estimate. But suppose these 50,000,000 acres were drained. They would yield an additional 100,000,000 bushels of wheat and 100,000,000 bushels of corn. This in land values alone this swamp area would increase from \$500,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000, as much as the maximum of the colossal Liberty Loan. The consequent benefits would be no less marked for the individual land owner. The augmented tax returns would be enough to reimburse the State and county, even if they bore entire cost of the reclamation projects, while the soil for any length of time would be property would be really incalculable.  
Georgia has the largest area of swamp and overflowed lands in any State on the Atlantic coast, with the single exception of Florida, and Florida is reclaiming her swamp lands at a truly herculean pace. One-seventh of Georgia's entire territory consists of land which must be drained before it can be used. But far from being a liability, this will prove a priceless asset. Reclamation is brought duly into service. The valley of the Nile itself does not exceed the fertility which the acres have packed into this swampy soil and which drainage will make easily available. While vast expenses are the Okefenokee present formidable engineering problems, there are thousands of acres which can be drained at a cost comparatively trivial, besides the profitable results which are certain to follow.  
In fact, few expenditures of public money yield such rich and speedy returns as do those for the reclamation of swamp or overflowed lands. Under the Georgia law authorizing the formation of drainage districts and the issuance of drainage bonds, these improvements can be made without burdening the taxpayers and property owners. It is a pity that the State has not been more liberal in its appropriations for the reclamation of its swampy lands. DAVID L. WITMER, Philadelphia, November 2.



**THE WILL TO WIN**  
VICTORY is assured tomorrow because the people have the will to win. No fight was ever won by forces that expected defeat. Thousands of contests have been won because one side entered the fight determined, to use every ounce of strength and power to defeat its opponents.  
The followers of football were surprised a few years ago when the eleven of Colgate defeated Yale. Colgate had played many games with the greater college and its men had been contented with the honor of appearing on the New Haven gridiron. One day some one said that this sort of thing had been going on long enough and that the time had come for the Colgate players to go to New Haven determined to put up the best fight that was in them. The whole college began to talk about defeating Yale. A deliberate campaign was planned to cultivate the will to win. After a year or two an eleven was built up, every man in which was determined to use every ounce of strength in him to the last minute of the game in an effort to defeat Yale. And Yale was defeated.  
The men of Colgate understood the psychology of victory.  
The voters of Philadelphia today are inspired by the same spirit which won the football victory.  
Everything that has happened since Mayor Blankenburg went out of office has strengthened their determination to seize control of their own government once more. The Fifth Ward outrages occurred at the right moment to set them on fire. Those outrages brought the methods of the political freebooters into the clear light of day. The public officers whose duty it was to protect the citizens in the free expression of their opinions were found to be engaged in co-operating with thugs to blackmail every voter who dared oppose the orders issued from the City Hall.  
As soon as the Town Meeting ticket was nominated the oligarchy that sits in City Hall began to use every trick and device to prevent the appearance at the polls tomorrow of an opposition ticket. Not content with appeals to the courts, the leaders used the police once more to bulldoze and intimidate the signers of the nomination petitions. This sort of thing might have been expected in the Russia of last year while it was still a despotism. It is an outrage such as makes the blood of every independent American citizen boil. It is but the consummation of the methods practiced by the freebooters who have been fattening at the public crib for a generation.  
Conditions are now so bad that it is inconceivable that they could be worse. Any change would be for the better. There are no citizens so indifferent to the result that they are taking no interest in the contest. Every man worthy the name knows that when the standard of conduct of our public servants can sink no lower the time has come to turn out the unfaithful and replace them with men of honor and high ideals.  
That time is now.  
But the forces of evil which have been behind all the thuggery and legal trickery and moral obfuscation of recent weeks will fight to the last ditch. It is important that honest citizens be on their guard tomorrow and that every illegal act of the police be resented instantly and every attempt to prevent the polling of an honest vote be checked before its consummation.  
If the voters should stand up to be counted today an overwhelming majority of them would be found supporting the Town Meeting ticket. They are going to the polls tomorrow to be counted in another way. The jails yawn for every man who attempts to prevent an honest vote. The jails got the men in Indianapolis and Terre Haute who monkeyed with the elections. The men of their kind in this city will do well to remember this.

**BALANCING LOSSES**  
WHEN the enemy made his last big "strategic retreat" in March he had no victory elsewhere to offset it. It was generally agreed that another German retreat on the west front would be an open confession of inferiority. Such a retreat seems to be under way. But this time the high command prepared the German people for it by creating a diversion in Italy. Under the cover of an impressive invasion in the south, the Germans have abandoned untenable ground along the Alps, having in the last ten days lost 422 cannon and 720 machine guns. It seems probable now that the Italian invasion was planned very largely because of expected trouble in the west. Some experts even talk of a possible retreat to the Meuse, with the surrender of nearly all the occupied French territory. Now would be the time to do it. With all Germany being told that Italy is hopelessly disabled.  
It is important to realize that the Germans did not dream of such a retreat last summer. The Crown Prince, from April to July, tried to overwhelm the French on the Chemin-des-Dames, employing seventy-one divisions, or about 1,065,000 men, and losing nearly 500,000, some say more, in the whole operation. Counting the huge casualties in the last month in Belgium and on the Aisne, we see a German loss at least three times as great as that of the Italians.

**Helps Men to Write Home**  
These are facts. The association is supplying paper, envelopes and stamps for men to write home from every army camp in this country and in France. Better still, if you have a son in the service, you will know what this means.  
When the men arrived at Camp Dix, Wrightstown, they were seen trying to write on pieces of paper, scraps of newspaper, boxes, beds and even on the ground. They had no writing facilities. The Government supplies none. The association now has supplied the missing necessities. It has headquarters at Camp Dix. From one hut alone 8000 letters for the "folks back home" were posted in one day. All facilities are supplied, including stationery, stamps, envelopes, ink and other things in countless varieties.  
An army official said only recently that if the Y. M. C. A. succeeded in getting the boys to write home, its whole existence would be more than justified. At Camp Dix the association distributes more than 1,000,000 sheets of writing paper monthly.  
One Y. M. C. A. shipment sent from Brooklyn—and it was only one of many—contained the following: Two hundred thousand sheets of writing paper, 100,000 packages of biscuits, 20,000 packages of chewing gum, 10 folding organs, 100 moving picture sheets of writing paper, 50,000 records, 500,000 pens, 27,000 checkers, meat, condensed milk, baseball bats, gloves, baseballs, tobacco, typewriters, magazines, ink and other things in countless varieties.  
In every cantonment the Y. M. C. A. "huts" in their quaint green paint, spell home for the soldiers in every sense of the word. They live in them, in the spare time. There are 400 "huts" scattered throughout the various army cantonments and 200 more have been ordered. They are made of iron, wood and canvas. In Russia, Italy, and there are more than forty along the River Nile.  
Although called "huts," these are better than the "bunkies" of the soldiers' eyes. They are large and roomy, with big fireplaces in each, books, magazines, chairs galore, not to mention long writing tables. The men can sit on their heels, or on chairs. Movies are given every night or Sunday. There are band concerts and singing which fairly shakes the roof from the building.  
The men do not sing hymns except occasionally. They sing rousing war songs. Able secretaries are leaders. Everything seems to be given over to the comfort of the men. It is planned to have one hut for every 5000 men in cantonment but the huts proved so popular that many more had to be ordered.

**Work Right at Firing Line**  
No effort is made to make "conversions" among the soldiers. All faiths are welcome and interdenominational. Catholic, Protestant and Jewish services have been held in the same hut.  
There always is "something on" at night. Entertainment of the best kind is provided. Every body gets up to do something. These are a great treat. When one realizes that after men there is nothing for the soldiers to do, it is a relief to see the huts have come to mean to them. One look at the cheery fireplaces with its sparkling big logs and with numerous chairs drawn around it, the men, healthy and happy, at once convinces the visitor. Besides supplying the men with many things they need, the association teaches boxing, French and singing.  
Secretaries meet the men on arrival at all ports "over there." The men, feeling rather lost, find themselves in huts in France similar to those back at home. The "strangeness" of a foreign landscape disappears. The secretaries work night and day. It would seem. They are confidential advisers, cheer leaders, and friends. At one of the recent battles the Y. M. C. A. distributed 25,000 cups of hot chocolate near the battlefield. The association gives such meals on going into the trenches. Two large packages of chocolate, to be used only if he is wounded. It would nourish him for two days while lying in "No Man's Land."  
Some secretaries are in the thick of the fighting bandaging light wounds, doing everything possible to help the men. There are associations of secretaries in the front trenches. The work of these secretaries is of the hardest kind. Many have given up good positions to undertake the work. Ask the soldiers themselves if the secretaries are slackers!  
All the warring nations have asked for more secretaries and more huts. The work has accomplished wonders. Not only does it help to a great extent to keep the men out of trouble, but also it nurses their spirits. It is a great comfort to a mother's care. Among the requests for more huts came one recently from the Vatican, begging that the work be undertaken on a scale larger than ever before.

**"A PRESIDENT OF HUMANITY"?**  
Internationalism Has Dodged This Question—Political Discussion  
To the Editor of the Evening Ledger:  
Sir—The suggestion in your financial column of October 26 that, following the democratization of the world, the war debts of the nations should be assumed by all, should not pass without comment, as it is one of the most luminous suggestions that have yet been made regarding that important subject—an international Government.  
Before noting the main point, which I wish especially to present, let me remind your writer that he would find no precedent in our Civil War, which made only the successful side's debt payable by the Interstate Government. Possibly, however, your writer only expects that international law, an "international executive" to execute those laws and handle the "navy" and "police," or an "international court," which acts legally, not a mere arbitration board. And it is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy" or "police" without provision for an executive is like saying there must be a hand without a man to use it. It will not do to say that an executive is inferred or assumed when one speaks of "navy" or "police," for it is not. It is plain that these necessities are not in their minds or they would be in their words. To speak of "navy