

The Charlottetown Guardian

President, Lieut.-Col. W. Chester S. McLara. Vice-President, J. R. Burnett, F. J. I. Secretary, Lieut.-Col. D. A. MacKinnon, D. S. O. Editor and Managing Director, J. R. Burnett, F. J. I. Associate Editors, Frank Walker and D. K. Currie. Morning Daily (founded 1887) \$1.00 per year (in advance) delivered in City, \$2.00 per year (in advance) mailed to Prince Edward Island, \$4.50 per year (in advance) Mailed to Canada and United States. FRIDAY, MARCH 27, 1936

Coming To The Point

It is useless for our contemporary to argue that "the present Government, in reconstructing and rehabilitating the Provincial Building, are carrying on the work which was commenced by their predecessors." In the first place, their predecessors undertook only such work as was necessary to keep the building in repair. In the second place, even this necessary work was denounced by Liberals as an unwarranted extravagance in the present state of the finances. That is the point, and not whether the new interior alterations are "in good taste" or whether they compare, or do not compare, with the "far more elaborate Parliament Buildings in other provincial capitals."

Let our contemporary has forgotten—as it evidently has—the policy on which the Government was elected, we quote the following timely reminder from the discussion in the Legislature at the special session last September:

Mr. H. H. ACORN: "I believe, in fact I am sure, that the only plank in the Liberal platform which appealed to the electors in the provincial campaign was that in which we promised to make revenue and expenditure meet."

Mr. WADE HUGHES: "What in the world was the good of the other planks, then?"

Mr. ACORN: "So far as our campaign was concerned they did not count at all."

Many taxpayers throughout the Province have taken The Guardian's advice and visited the Provincial Building during the past few weeks to see for themselves the nature of the work on which thousands of dollars have been squandered unnecessarily. They know that The Guardian criticism in this regard is correct. They also know that Mr. ACORN's statement is correct, and that the discrepancy between what the Government is doing and what it promised to do is so glaring as to be almost inconceivable.

Straight From The Shoulder

What attitude the CAMPBELL Government now entertains toward the Ottawa scheme to scrap the B.N.A. Act as an Imperial statute its mouthpiece, The Patriot, refuses to say. "Silence is golden"; and it is unfortunate, since our contemporary is unwilling to divulge the truth, that it did not observe a consistent policy of silence with regard to this vitally important matter. A few days ago it misled its readers into supposing that there was no danger to minority provincial rights from the conferences at Ottawa, the object, it claimed, being merely "to study in every aspect the necessity of amending the constitution, and the best means of providing suitable machinery for that purpose."

The Liberal Attorney-General of New Brunswick may be assumed to know quite as much about the drift of the recent Ottawa conferences as our contemporary does. He is not at all disposed to take Premier CAMPBELL's attitude that the question at issue should be kept "strictly secret." This gentleman—Hon. J. B. McNAIR—delivered himself of a very forceful comment on the subject last Tuesday in the New Brunswick Legislature; and as his statements apply with equal truth to Prince Edward Island's position we need make no apology for quoting some of them here:

"Honourable members have no doubt seen in the newspapers of the province despatches emanating from Toronto and Ottawa indicating that the movement (to amend the B.N.A. Act) has been enlarged to embrace proposals for the enactment of an entirely new constitution set by the Parliament of Canada and the consequent repeal at Westminster of the British North America Act."

"In my view such a scheme would entirely destroy our federal fabric. The division of legislative and executive powers, which is the pith and substance of a federal system of government, must depend for its maintenance and stability upon a paramount law: In our case upon the supremacy of Imperial Legislation."

"This Legislature holds its present powers because New Brunswick is an autonomous, self-governing province of Great Britain, sovereign within the sphere defined for her by the B.N.A. Act and independent of the Canadian Parliament."

"Under the new proposals she would become a mere territorial division of the Dominion and hold her powers by way of gift from the Parliament of Canada. To acknowledge the supremacy of the latter would be to confess our own subservency and subordination."

"It has been openly asserted in some quarters that we may be forced into the new legislative union against our will. I feel that should such an attempt be made it will be found that the Imperial Parliament is still British, I am still more confident that any attempt at tyranny of that sort will but mean the end of all union."

It takes backbone for a Liberal Attorney General to talk in this fashion to a Liberal Government at Ottawa. Would that we had some evidence of it over here!

Evolution Of A Demagogue

A striking demonstration was given in the House of Commons this week by Mr. BENNETT of the difference between government under himself during the past five years and government under the present Liberal administration. And the distinction was not—as all who heard Mr. KING and his followers inveighing against autocracy and dictatorship in those campaign days of last October might have suspected—that government was no longer conducted by order-in-Council. Instead, the difference was that whereas Mr. BENNETT employed order-in-Council which all who run might read, the present Liberal Prime Minister is using order-in-Council of which even Parliament may not know the content!

The disclosure of all this (writes an Ottawa correspondent) was rather a jolt to the Liberal rank-and-file in the House, who have fancied themselves as "Democracy's saviours" ever since that memorable day last Autumn when they

oust "Dictator" BENNETT. They learned, from Mr. KING's own mouth on Monday, that in that regard they were making the naive mistake of taking the pre-election fulminations of their leader too seriously.

Mr. BENNETT first shattered these back-bench Liberal illusions by asking for the tabling of all orders-in-Council passed by the ministry since it had assumed office. What he was after specifically were the orders passed under the celebrated "peace, order and good government" legislation so vigorously attacked by Mr. KING in the campaign. Logically, of course, there should not have been any such orders. In fact, after what had been said by Liberals about government by order-in-Council, there should have been very few orders at all, and the Liberal Prime Minister should have been waiting for the opportunity to demonstrate the fact to the House and to the country.

Consequently, when he refused flatly, instead, to comply with the Conservative leader's request, there was an awkward silence on the Liberal side of the House. Mr. BENNETT, with sarcasm sufficiently veiled to be described as choice, suggested that surely the stage in dictatorship had not been reached in Canada where Parliament was refused knowledge of what its executive did! If Mr. KING was going to take that attitude, the Conservative leader intimated, his supporters would have to endorse it by their votes. Mr. KING did not alter his dictum. Mr. BENNETT compelled the vote, not recorded, but verbal. The Liberal back-benchers, their dreams as Democracy's champions shattered, looked unhappy—but voted.

So no one will ever know how many orders-in-Council the ministry has passed, or how many of them have been under the "iniquitous"—according to Mr. KING in his best campaign form—peace, order, and good government legislation!

And Mr. KING's grandfather, whose republican shade was invoked with such fervour by the Liberal leader in his speech here in Charlottetown—however will he be able to claim kinship with that old gentleman again, without blushing from the roots of his hair to the soles of his feet!

Editorial Notes

Spring showers, ever so gentle.

Store improvements are the order of the day.

Time flies; it is just 24 years ago today since the great CECIL RHODES died.

No fewer than 26,842 dozen eggs were imported from the United States last year.

Alberta dividends, like a lot of stock-exchange dividends, are being passed this year.

There is stated to be no truth in the report that a black horse will be on parade at the opening of the legislature on Monday.

The Charlottetown-Borden Highway has stood the winter well. A party came by car yesterday in an hour-and-ten minutes.

HITLER declares it is "the entire German people that is extending its hand to the entire French people." That's the whole trouble—the menacing fist.

A correspondent writes: "Mr. KING has reduced the duty on whiskey \$3.00 per gallon. Ergo. Every gallon we drink will make us \$3.00 richer. Let us all start in to drink whiskey."

More than half of the butter imported in 1935 was purchased in the United States, but the great bulk of it was manufactured elsewhere, such as New Zealand 91,360 lbs., Australia 24,192 lbs., Denmark 22,624 lbs.

In New York the judges have little sympathy with drunken drivers. Two men appealed fines imposed for driving while drunk. The Appellate Court differed with the punishment meted out, and changed it to a fine of \$500 each and three months in jail.

Fascists are not getting much sympathy in England. Under the direction of Sir OSWALD MOSLEY they held a demonstration in the Albert Hall, and required a force of 500 mounted and unmounted police to protect them from 3,500 Anti-Fascist demonstrators who marched on the hall.

It is now stated Premier HEPBURN has decided not to retire from politics at the close of the present session. Similarly the gossip around Tammany Hall is that Mr. ALFRED E. SMITH's projected walk-out of the Democratic Convention in June will not materialize. Like Mr. HEPBURN, Mr. SMITH has had lots of time to think out the matter since his quarrel with his chief.

Mr. ALFRED JOHNSON BROOKS, B.A., B.C.L., and M.P. for Royal N.B., who has the honour to represent the Maritime Opposition in the House of Commons, is a Methodist, a Conservative, a Lawyer and a Major in the 26th Bn. C.E.F. He was Conservative organizer for N.B. in 1922-25; and was first elected to the House of Commons at last general election.

So Ontario's picture of LAURA SECORD will remain in the legislative building's hall of fame, even if it covers the portrait of former Premier GEORGE W. ROSS. "I guess the picture will remain," Premier HEPBURN said. "A sister of MILDRED PEEL, who painted it, wrote me recently and advised we shouldn't do anything with the painting. She said that underneath there was a picture of Sir GEORGE, but that it was very incomplete, so there would be no use in our trying to restore it." The picture was painted in 1904 and sold to the government in 1905 by Miss PEEL. Miss PEEL first painted a picture of the Premier to whom she later was married but the government turned it down. She painted on the same canvas the portrait of the Canadian woman who saved a British force in the war of 1812.

Notes by the Way

There is an element, and a fairly substantial one, in Canada that prefers American magazines to Canadian publication. That is a regrettable thing, but it is probably the one which dictated the course of the Government in allowing the free entry of American magazines. The fact that these magazines can now be obtained at a lower price than when a duty was imposed means substantial increase in their circulation and consequent decline in the circulation of the Canadian products. This is not a matter that concerns the newspapers in a business way. It does concern them, and all patriotic thought in the country, as it affects the development of Canadian ideals. The newspapers of the Dominion have a mission of national significance in sustaining the plea that Canadian magazines should have right of way for circulation in the country where they are published.—Victoria Colonist.

The critical meeting of the League council resulted, as was fully expected, in condemnation of Germany's act. Where it was disappointing was in the blustering of the German representative, Joachim von Ribbentrop. It was not imagined that Germany would profess repentance. The sinner who commits a calculated crime is not likely to confess his guilt and sue for forgiveness, unless badly frightened of consequences. Since in this case the consequences did fall to be very much, if not altogether, as Germany wants them, there was no great expectation that she would display a humble and contrite spirit. Nonetheless it would have been more tactful and certainly more in keeping with Hitler's claim to be the "herald of peace in Europe" if von Ribbentrop had kept quiet or contented himself with a formal expression of dissent. All his disclaimers are old stuff and his sneer at the Hague court shows that Germany's "justification" rests on might, not right.—Ex.

Scarlet fever continues in epidemic proportions in Edmonton, the medical officer of health yesterday reporting 330 cases to date. There have been two deaths. The efficacy of preventive treatment would appear to be demonstrated in the fact that of 840 children fully inoculated only two subsequently contracted the disease.—Edmonton Journal.

The other day a girl of thirteen brought up her first venture in the writing of fiction. It wasn't very good, she said, modestly, because she wasn't enough on words in it, and did not use any metaphors. She was able to sell it, she went on, and she had thought of some more great big words? We thought of the incident when we read extracts printed on this page yesterday from a speech by Mr. Dunning in the House of Commons. The minister of finance was talking about money and taxation and he said:

"It is not a question of borrowing in the future, it is a question of taking it from all of us to give it to some of us." And again: "From year to year we must go on raising from all of us that which we spend either on all of us or on some of us." Here is a sentence of 27 words, and only two of them are longer than one syllable. It is smooth and fluid. It strikes no note in the ear, and above all it conveys to the hearer or reader precisely the meaning Mr. Dunning intended should be conveyed and that is, or ought to be, the intent of all speaking and writing.—Ottawa Journal.

It is sometimes said that we pay our statesmen inadequately in comparison with what similar ability and energy might earn in other walks of life. The case of Mr. Anthony Eden, Sir Samuel Hoar's successor at the foreign office, almost confirms this theory. This handsome young minister's personality, since his meteoric rise, has aroused extraordinary popular interest and sympathy in other countries besides his own. He is in danger of becoming a picture postcard best-seller on both sides of the broad Atlantic. For he seems to have gripped the imagination of our American cousins quite as strongly as he has that of our own people, and especially, of course, the feminine imagination. It is seriously stated that if he cared to sacrifice his ministerial career, Mr. Eden could secure an immediate film contract at Hollywood which, for a single picture, would bring him five times his year's salary as foreign secretary. Mr. George Arliss' nose would be quite out of joint.—London Letter in Ottawa Journal.

We have laws against gun carrying; we demand that firearms be registered, but we have not gone far enough. The skulking variety of people continue to put guns in their pockets when they start out on illegal projects, and they still find they are able to buy bullets or shells with which to shoot people, Edward Stonehouse, of Markham, is dead and his son is in the hospital because people can still defy the laws of the country.—Peterboro Examiner.

Sea walls melt before the tempestuous waves; rivers overflow their banks and inundate the countryside; ships turn turtle, drowning their crews; walls crumble, houses are smashed to ruin. Mankind's ordered pace falters before the fury of the storm. Each tempest brings us this lesson, a lesson old as time, for ever new. Ultimately, our greatest plans still stand or fall by Nature's caprice. Commerce, industry, communications, research, must march as the winds decree. Even warfare takes its time from the tempest. Even Mussolini cannot stop the rains.—Manchester Sunday Chronicle.

PUBLIC FORUM

This column is open for the discussion by correspondents of questions of interest. The Charlottetown Guardian does not necessarily endorse the opinions of correspondents.

PROHIBITION UNWORKABLE

Sir,—On the question of drunkenness, both the prohibitionist and the anti-prohibitionist are in perfect accord. But on the method of curtailing drunkenness, there is a vast difference in their respective policies.

To realize his objective, the prohibitionist resorts to a method conceived in the mind of a Persian dreamer seventeen centuries ago and subsequently utilized by the Prophet of Islam. The anti-prohibitionist prefers to strike at the root of the evil by rectifying the human heart. History bears testimony to the failure of the Prohibition method. In the Turkish dominions, it was enforced with a bloody fanaticism for thirteen hundred years. And in our own day, Kemal Pasha has abolished it as one of their great experimental mistakes. In the United States, after thirteen years of ruthless but futile effort to render it successful, it has been cut out of the body of fundamental law by the Supreme Court. The history of the "noble experiment" of each of the nine Canadian Provinces has tried it and, with the exception of Prince Edward Island, all have rejected it, not only as an ineffective temperance measure, but as being provocative of a host of other social evils at least equally as pernicious as drunkenness.

Conceived in Paganism, nurtured in fanaticism, thriving on violence, Prohibition has a dynamic tendency to dull the moral sense and warp the judgment of those who sponsor it. Allow me to illustrate! In the Detroit case of October, 6th, 1932, we read the following: "Douglas McPherson was sentenced Monday to serve two years in Leavenworth Penitentiary for Court Charles C. Simons in Federal Court for stealing \$10,928. 'Your case is one of the most difficult kind for a judge,' said Judge Simons, 'you are not really a criminal and I am certain that you would not err again if released. But other young men who might be tempted to steal if you were released must be thought of in passing sentence in this case.' Thus we find a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$40,000. Two years in jail at \$20,000 a year! Would that not seem like a highly profitable adventure for young men of kleptomaniac tendencies? But here is a federal judge sympathizing with a criminal, telling him that he is not a criminal, although he was caught stealing \$