

legging thrives under such conditions, with liquor bought from the Government, immediately after the Government agencies close for the day, as well as on Sundays and holidays. And if the hours of sale are extended for that reason, and the places of sale multiplied, the secondary object of the bill, the promotion of temperance, is defeated.

The claim made that Government control, outside of Ontario, is an advanced temperance measure has appeared absurd in view of the columns of liquor advertising in the daily newspapers and the multitude of billboards inciting people to drink. But Ontario proposes to prohibit public advertising of liquor, and with it the practice of the liquor interests to subsidize the newspapers, indirectly, by buying large advertising space.

The new law forbids drinking in public places. It imposes a penalty of imprisonment, without the option of a fine, for every one who buys or sells liquor except through a Government agency. It authorizes the Liquor Control Board to set up stores for the sale of beer, other stores for the sale of beer and wines, and still others for the sale of all kinds of alcoholic beverages. It does not permit the Board to open a store of any kind in a district that voted itself dry under local option before prohibition became law.

Liquor may be bought by any resident more than twenty-one years of age who obtains a yearly permit. The quantities and dates of purchases must be indorsed upon the back of the permit. Visitors may obtain a monthly permit on payment of a small fee. Rooms in hotels and auto camps will be considered places of residence. Ontario will have a system under which hundreds of citizens will be walking the streets every day carrying in their pockets bottles of hard stuff they have just bought from Government stores.

In some of the provinces under Government control the breweries have run amuck. In spite of British Columbia's failure, Ontario will try to prevent anything of the kind by putting a Government official in each brewery.

Under the regulating powers of the Liquor Board, persons who sell native wines are not to be required to take out licenses.

The new law will be administered by a commission headed by D. M. Hanna, formerly the head of the Canadian National Railways. The hotel men are already saying that it will give rise to intolerable conditions. An agitation for the sale of beer and wines with meals is assuming considerable proportions.

## Biased Justice in Ohio

THE United States Supreme Court has decided that a certain tooth in the Ohio statutes for enforcing prohibition is more than properly sharp—improperly barbed. By the statute in question prohibition fines are ordained to be divided equally between the State treasury and the township, municipality, or county where the prosecution is held.

In the particular case under appeal, the Mayor of the village of North College Hill, Ohio, had convicted one Ed Tumey of violating the State Prohibition Law, had fined him \$100, and had ordered him imprisoned until the fine should be paid. The Supreme Court supported Tumey's contention that his conviction had been without due process of law, on the ground that the Mayor was disqualified from trying him, not only because he had an official interest in the village, which would profit financially from conviction, but also because under a North College Hill ordinance he would be reimbursed for his own costs in the case only from the fine which would follow a conviction. The Supreme Court decided that those two provisions might normally be considered motives for conviction and that they might have deprived the defendant of a fair trial.

The Ohio prohibition enforcement statutes were deliberately devised to encourage energetic prosecution of violations of the law. But more important even than stopping flagrant law violation is it that no man shall be deprived of justice, no matter if he be shamefully guilty. The Supreme Court has helped, not hurt, the cause of prohibition enforcement by this decision; for it has removed a wrong begotten by a right.

## The Sea Powers and Their Navies

GREAT BRITAIN and Japan have accepted the suggestion of President Coolidge of a three-Power conference at Geneva in June on the subject of limitation of auxiliary naval armaments. In replying, the United States has voiced a hope that France and Italy may decide to be represented in some manner, and President Coolidge has invited them to send observers. Thus, with a conference on cruisers and submarines made a certainty, the way is opened for France and Italy to reconsider their unwillingness to agree to President Coolidge's first proposal for a five-Power conference.

It remains a question whether they will change their minds. In any case, even if the weight of the great sea Powers does swing them into line, they will not take any whole-hearted part in the discussions and resolutions of the con-

ference. Both of them contend that questions of naval strength are inseparable from army strength, and that the whole problem of reduction of armaments must be considered as a unity. Their position serves to bring into sharper relief a division between the great nations which has been increasingly revealed since the war. That is the division between the land and the sea Powers.

Great Britain and Japan are primarily interested, for their security and self-support, in the safety of the sea lanes of commerce. France, despite her colonial holdings in Africa and Asia, is more interested in security on the Continent of Europe. Italy, with her long coast-lines and also with colonies in Africa, is more concerned with sea power than France, but remains most vitally concerned with the maintenance of order on the Continent.

The United States occupies a unique position between the two groups. So far as security and self-support are concerned, it enjoys command of the resources of a continent. But so far as international relations are concerned, its interests lie with the sea Powers. Consequently, our Government desires to have the problems of naval limitation dealt with separately.

Meanwhile Great Britain and Japan are proceeding with their navy-building programs, and our Navy Department has called for bids on the construction of six new cruisers. These include three which—we are glad to record—the President approved in signing the appropriation bill that was passed against his own original recommendations. So the stakes of the sea Powers are on the conference table.

## King and Saklatvala

SENATOR KING, of Utah, has just enacted the rôle played about a year and a half ago by the British member of Parliament, Saklatvala. The Republic of Haiti is playing the rôle that in the Saklatvala case was taken by our Department of State. In announcing the exclusion of Senator King, President Borno, of Haiti, has said that his presence within the territory of the Haitian Republic would create disturbance because he had "publicly uttered in the United States a false and offensive declaration against the President of Haiti and his coadjutors" and had "made himself in the United States the agent of the worst element of disorder in Haitian politics." It is not possible to suppose that President Borno would have made this protest without feeling sure that his

right to make it would be upheld by the United States Department of State. And in doing so President Borno would be making a reasonable assumption, for it is hardly to be supposed that our State Department would deny to another country the right to exclude an American legislator on grounds virtually identical with those which the Department of State had applied to a legislator of Great Britain.

### The New Rector of the Sorbonne

THE death of M. Paul Lapie, the Rector of the Sorbonne, in Paris, left open a position which might have been expected to arouse a large amount of political discussion before a successor could be chosen, for the Sorbonne is more than an educational institution—it is an important center of French political and public thought. But the vacancy was filled in less than two weeks by what appears to have been a unanimous choice; and M. Sebastien Charléty moved from the University of Strasbourg to the University of Paris.

M. Charléty, equipped by service as Director of Public Education in Tunis and as Director-General of Public Education in Alsace-Lorraine after the war, finds himself in a position held for the first time—and that quite unofficially—by Abélard in the twelfth century, when the fame of the great savant's teaching brought scholars by thousands to the school in the shadow of the Cathedral of Notre Dame. A small institution this at first, attached to the church as a matter of course, and with a faculty that could easily live on the "Ile de la Cité." It was not long, however, before the Left Bank was needed for housing space for the teachers, as students poured in from all over Europe. Here each taught in his own home, liberated to a great degree from ecclesiastical supervision; but for their own interest instructors formed a corporation with their students. What we know popularly to-day as the Sorbonne takes its name from Robert of Sorbon, chaplain to Louis XI, who, moved by the poverty of many of the students, bought some houses near the Palace of the Cluny in 1253, and there lodged and fed many of the poorest, in which pious task he was abetted by the King.

The students were thus gradually led to organize in various ways. First, they elected a rector to represent them when their interests brought the "Universitas," or "Corporation," into contact with other organizations. Then they formed the four "Faculties" of Liberal Arts, Law, Medicine, and Theology. The final step was the grouping of the stu-

dents according to nationalities: Normandy, Picardy, England, and France. "Hospitia"—dormitories for national groups—became known as "colleges." Though they were established with no idea of utilization as teaching units, it soon became evident that the colleges provided an excellent means of having students study under supervision. When, therefore, teachers also took up their residence within these walls, the college took form as we know the institution to-day.

### Shifting Balances in Europe

THE nations at Geneva have been treated to the spectacle of Dr. Stresemann, Foreign Minister of Germany, presiding over the Council of the League of Nations. In negotiations with M. Briand of France, Sir Austen Chamberlain of Great Britain, and M. Zaleski of Poland he has found it possible to settle two difficult disputes—one by provision for an Inter-Allied military patrol in place of the French patrol of the Sarre coal basin pending the plebiscite which is to decide its final disposition, and the other by an agreement on principles to determine what children may be allowed to attend German-language schools in Poland. The German Nationalists have been howling behind his back in Berlin, but he has explained his policy to President Hindenburg, and it is probable that it will secure the necessary support.

While this peace-making has been under way at Geneva, Italy has disturbed many of the Foreign Offices of Europe by ratifying the treaty of 1920 with Rumania, by which Bessarabia was annexed to Rumania from Russia. It is understood that the final agreement with Italy was reached in return for petroleum and trade concessions; and there has also been talk of British anti-Russian influence with the Italian Government, which British officials have denied. The importance of the Italian action at the moment, however, is not so much in its effect on Russia—despite the significant plea of Germany's spokesman at Geneva for resumption of relations with Russia—as in its effect on the Balkans. It dangerously strains the so-called "Little Entente" between Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Rumania.

Being Slavic states, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, although anti-Soviet, tend naturally to sympathize with Russia. The King and Queen of Yugoslavia have departed suddenly and in secret for Rumania, apparently to learn the diplomatic meaning of the new move. And among the consequences of Italy's ratification of the Bessarabian treaty, al-

though it is already recognized by France, are these:

Increasing rivalry between France and Italy in Central Europe and the Balkans.

Stronger tendencies in France, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia for an understanding with Germany, and eventually Russia.

Closer relations between Italy, Hungary, and Rumania.

Increasing activity on the part of Italy in Albania, the next-door neighbor of Yugoslavia to the south on the Adriatic.

A revival of Russian activity in the Slavic states of the Balkans, along the lines of the old Pan-Slav policy.

Where all this regrouping of forces may end no one now can tell; but any one who remembers that trouble started in the Balkans in 1914 cannot help having some concern for "the peace of Europe."

### Cæsar in Somaliland

A NEWSPAPER despatch from Rome announces the final subjugation of the remaining independent tribes of Italian Somaliland. Somaliland, divided between Britain, France, Italy, and Abyssinia, is the easternmost part of Africa, constituting a triangle protruding between the Indian Ocean and the Gulf of Aden. Italian Somaliland is the Indian Ocean coast and hinterland portion of the triangle, with a short segment abutting on the Gulf of Aden east of British Somaliland. The southern half of Italian Somaliland has been a crown colony since 1910; but the whole country has been an Italian sphere of influence since late in the last century.

The land is sparsely settled and poor in natural resources. The foreign population, almost all Italians, is small. Nevertheless the Italian civil government of southern Italian Somaliland has built more than 2,000 miles of roads and a short section of railroad.

With the advent of Fascism's aggressive colonial policy came the determination to bring all of Italian Somaliland directly under Italian sovereignty. The Somalis of the northern region, stalwart warriors, resisted stoutly. But finally, according to the despatch from Rome, the "rebels," with their leader, the Sultan of Mejertin, a refugee in British Somaliland, have formally surrendered their firearms. The movement to subjugate them began in 1925. This news focuses interestingly with the Italian revocation of every degree of self-government in the North African colonies.

In America, three seas away, it is difficult to see the advantage of occupying a poor land against the will of its inhabi-