

This all goes to show that a public official must at least be consistent if he hopes to escape criticism. There are a great many things about Governor Ritchie that we admire, but it is fair to state that he was in error when he protested vigorously against the lynching of an individual and remained silent regarding the violation of the eighteenth amendment. The chief executive of Maryland, as an individual, is entitled to hold to the views of his own choosing, but when he takes an oath to uphold the constitution and the laws of his State and the nation, it does not become him to wink at one law violation and condemn another group for taking the law in their hands. But Governor Ritchie is not the only inconsistent public official in this country, as we notice that the chief executive of Virginia has of late come in for a great deal of criticism. Not long ago the latter was a bit caustic in condemning the practice of transporting voters to the polls on election days. He insinuated that this was a species of bribery that should not be tolerated, but few agreed with him. The fact is, the Newport News Press, a friend of the complainant, dissented and in so doing had the following to say:

"The resentment of the voters of this and other cities over Governor Pollard's statement to the effect that hauling people to the polls is, in many instances, just another way of buying a man's vote is natural. The practice, as the Governor says, used to be unlawful. But in very rare instances when a person is taken to the polls is that person's vote influenced one way or the other.

"The Daily Press cannot follow the Governor when he says that, 'I oppose the hiring of cars first, because it favors rich candidates, and second, because it gives a chance to buy a man as well as his car.' This is a reflection upon the man who owns the car, the man who hires the car, and the man or the woman who rides in the car.

"As Sheldon Harwood, chairman of the City Democratic Committee so persistently asks, was the Gov-

ernor satisfied with the carrying of voters to the polls to vote for him? If the practice is bad now, why was it not bad then. And if bad then, why did he not discourage it?"