

the brain and the way it acts on muscle and nerve is all good.

"It is all a part of the machinery, and they know a terrible lot about the working of machinery. But there is something more to be said than that. Anybody can point out how a typewriter works, and you cannot get it to go unless it is properly connected and in good order. But that does not explain the sense or meaning of what comes out of it."

Sir John Sutton, surgeon, then came to the side of Sir Arthur Keith.

"True, absolutely true," he said. "Death is the end of all. My experience is that all of those who have studied the subject scientifically and deeply have come to the same conclusion. Once, reviewing a book of Flammarion's, I wrote:

"In the dim future do not seek to peep, trying to fathom things obscure and deep. Youth often laughs at death, but old men weep. Wise men know death to be an endless sleep."

"Endless sleep—I cannot put it better than that."

So the question stands as before—with two irreconcilable answers.

From Washington

Hoover, Defendant

HERBERT HOOVER, candidate for President, sat on the witness-stand before a committee of five Senators. He seemed to feel that, guilty of nothing, he sat there as defendant. The Committee was judge, jury, prosecutor, and, so far as such a thing existed, defense counsel. The atmosphere was unfortunate.

Members of the Committee, Chairman Steiwer leading and the other four following, asked Mr. Hoover concerning a multitude of small things which may have seemed to him—which might have seemed to any man in his place—irrelevant. A lawyer might have seen that the ground was being laid for testimony which the Committee expected would be offered by other witnesses.

To a lay spectator, the Committee appeared to show deference to Mr. Hoover's position and importance in affairs. Members of the Committee, referring to notes from documents filed with the Committee, asked questions nearly always with explanation, occasionally with something approaching apology. Many of the questions might, perhaps, better not have been asked.

Mr. Hoover appeared from the outset resentful, half angry, injured. Before a



Kirby in the New York World

"Look, daddy!"

popular audience, there is little doubt that his resentment would have found support. But the audience that he had was made up mainly of case-hardened newspaper men who, as one of them expressed it, found "more news in the questions than in the answers."

Resentment

MR. HOOVER'S anger smoldered. Only once did it approach a flame. That was when Senator Barkley asked him if he had recommended an increase in the price of chinaware. "Grotesque," said Mr. Hoover. He wondered if the Committee was not "dealing in pretty small things."

Senator Barkley laid down his notes and said, quietly and without show of irritation, that he had tried to avoid service on the Committee, that the complaint to which he had referred had been made to the Committee by responsible



Halladay in the Providence Journal

Not a soul in sight

persons, that if untrue the fact should be known, that he would continue to ask questions justified by material filed with the Committee.

Mr. Hoover said, "I think you are right, Senator."

"Then," said Senator Barkley, "if it is right, it is not grotesque, and it is not small."

Senator Dale—the only time that he spoke aloud during the examination—said to Mr. Hoover: "Why are you resentful of the efforts of this Committee to do what it was instructed to do? It seems clear that you are resentful." Mr. Hoover replied in a voice not audible at the press table. "I am glad," said Senator Dale, "that you have said that. We should have thought otherwise."

The necessity for such scenes—if it is a necessity—is a most unfortunate thing in our politics.

Mr. Hoover's testimony, in so far as it bore directly upon the matter of campaign expenditures, was that he had himself spent but four or five hundred dollars to promote his candidacy; that, so far as he knew, none of his relatives had contributed anything; that he had made no promises of patronage; that he had nothing which could properly be called a central organization; that, so far as he knew, the money for his campaign had been raised by his friends in the States where it was spent. He furnished the names of persons who could give definite information.

Former Representative James W. Good, a leader in Mr. Hoover's campaign, gave the Committee definite figures as to campaign funds. Expenditures have amounted, he said, to \$241,274. The accounting is not quite complete, but Mr. Good did not think that, with everything accounted for, the total to date would reach \$250,000.

Candidates Know Little

WITH the examination of Governor Smith in New York, the Senate Campaign Funds Committee completed the examination of candidates with the exception of Frank O. Lowden and, if he should be deemed a candidate, Vice-President Dawes. The information thus far gained appears to have little significance.

Governor Smith testified that he had spent nothing, done nothing to promote his candidacy, made no commitments, and knew nothing about expenditures in his behalf. His campaign manager in New York testified that collections so far had amounted to \$103,000 and expenditures to \$92,000.

The only other candidates in whose behalf the spending of any sum worth mentioning has been revealed are Senators Curtis and Reed. For each of these the reported expenditures have been around \$10,000.

If the Committee is to uncover anything in the least sensational, it must find witnesses who know more about the candidates than the candidates know about themselves.

Worse than Fall

"THE moral turpitude of corrupters of public servants is even greater than that of those whom they debauch."

Business must "purge itself of all those who indulge in commercial and political corruption and through resort to unclean or unworthy practices bring business into disrepute and shock the sensibilities of all decent citizens.

"Stockholders cannot accept the profits following from corruption and escape the moral stigma which adheres in such profits, neither can they permit those who act for them to profit personally through corrupt corporate transaction or to shield others who do."

So, by resolution, declared the Chamber of Commerce of the United States at its recent meeting here. Repudiation of those business men who corrupt or defy the Government which protects them was the note which ran through all of the proceedings. It was sounded at the opening meeting by Judge Edwin B. Parker, Chairman of the Board of Directors, and culminated in resolutions adopted at the last meeting.

The Chamber asserted that the practices which it condemned have been engaged in, but did not give any names. There may have been little difficulty in reading between the lines the name of Sinclair, but the inclusion or exclusion of other names was, perhaps, a task beyond the ability of the Chamber. It was coincidence that just when the Chamber was making this denunciation there was made public the demand of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., for the resignation of Colonel R. W. Stewart as Chairman of the Board of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana.

Compromise

THREE bills on which vetoes have appeared likely at one time or another will probably be before the President as this issue of *The Outlook* comes to its readers, and there is good ground for hope that the veto has been avoided on all but one—the McNary-Haugen Farm Relief Bill. As to the other two—the Missis-

sippi River Flood Relief Bill and the Shipping Board Replacement Bill—the rather quiet but none the less firm pressure of the President brought about important changes after they seemed impossible. Though neither bill is now wholly pleasing to either Congress or the President, they are very likely better bills than they would have been had all

of the wishes of either party been met. Thus it comes about that, in government, the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.

The McNary-Haugen Bill is probably hopeless—and that for the reason that there was not the good will in adjustment that marked the compromise efforts on the other two bills.

Windows on the World

By Malcolm W. Davis

THE AMERICAN PLAN to outlaw war by a general treaty is making headway under some difficulty. In Great Britain all the parties in Parliament have declared in favor of it. Sir Austen Chamberlain, speaking for the Cabinet, said that the Government would stand ready to do anything in its power to obtain unity on Secretary Kellogg's proposal. Ramsay MacDonald, as head of the Labor Opposition, had reproofed the Ministry mildly for delay in replying to the note from the United States. He wanted quick acceptance without reservations. Lloyd George chimed in for the Liberal minority. And Sir Austen answered that the Government was simply trying "to get everybody to understand the full implications of the Kellogg proposal" in order to secure a document that all could sign in the same spirit. Obviously, that refers to France and her reservations.

For his part, the British Foreign Secretary declared that he thought it quite possible to reconcile the Kellogg treaty with all engagements under the League of Nations and the Locarno arbitration treaties of the European Powers. The American draft treaty, he reported, had been referred to the Dominions, and on receipt of their views the Government would answer the United States—an unanswerable explanation of delay in Great Britain.

From France, reports have indicated that Sir Austen's speech was taken as final evidence of agreement of all the Powers on the desirability of a joint treaty against war. Italy, to be sure, has simply offered "cordial collaboration" without stating her attitude toward the Kellogg treaty or the French reservations. Premier Mussolini adhered to the British suggestion of a conference of jurists to adjust the differences between the two points of view, but added that the meeting could be effective only if the United States would send a legal expert. Since Secretary Kellogg has announced

his opposition to the plan, it seems apparent that it will be dropped.

Meanwhile Jacob Gould Schurman, American Ambassador to Germany, slowed up the diplomatic machinery with a speech acknowledging an honorary degree from the University of Heidelberg. Asserting that he had been impressed with the similarity of the fundamental international ideals of the Governments and peoples of the two countries, he declaimed:

"Germany and the United States are marching forward in a great and noble adventure in the cause of human civilization. I earnestly hope, I confidently expect, that all other nations of the world will join them in this glorious procession."

French spokesmen in Paris at once rose to object. Who originally advanced the scheme to outlaw war, they asked—France and the United States or Germany and the United States? And did Germany's acceptance of the American draft for a treaty mean that France no longer had anything to do with the affair? In Washington officials of the Department of State made it known that they had no word of the text of Ambassador Schurman's speech before it was delivered; and so it could not be taken as the view of the Administration.

In Paris, Stéphane Lauzanne, the influential editor of the "*Matin*," published an article deploring the day when M. Briand for France proposed to the United States a treaty against war between the two nations. That led, he argued, to a flight from the solid ground of actualities into the clouds of visionary hope for a world made peaceful without guaranties. The Franco-Slav system is logical, he contended, while the Anglo-Saxon system is idealistic. By these terms he obviously meant practical and impractical.

Evidently the movement to outlaw war still has some ground to gain—before it reaches the Senate.