

shall have a vast membership, which will demand proper enforcement of laws that are vital to the home, and the enacting of others by our national and State legislative bodies."

PRESS OPINIONS

In Bryan We Trust.

The Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Oct. 3, 1908.—O, thus be it ever, when Bryan shall stand between our loved homes and the trusts' spoliation! Blest with Bryan and Kern may this near-rescued land praise the pair who will bring its complete liberation. Then conquer we must, for we've got to or bust, and this be our motto: In Bryan we trust! And the bar stangled spanner in triumph we'll wave if we manage to win by a mighty close shave!

+ +

Cannon's Wealth and Bryan's.

Puck (neutral), Sept. 30.—Our American Abdul, Speaker Cannon, made a mistake in attacking Mr. Bryan; he laid himself open to certain obvious come-backs; and Mr. Bryan is especially swift on the come-back. . . . His remarks about Mr. Bryan's wealth called forth a challenge to declare the sum of his own possessions and to say how he came by them. Now, the Nebraskan's personal honesty has never been impugned; what he possesses he made by talking and writing. Mr. Cannon is reported a much richer man than Bryan, and he did not acquire his money by talking and writing. The opponents of the Peerless One would better confine their attacks to criticisms of the political theories he puts forth, and let his personal affairs alone. If they were all as honest as he there would be no call for muckrakers.

+ +

Mr. Roosevelt's Pet Trust.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), September 28.—Mr. Roosevelt seeks to minimize the merging of the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company into the Steel Trust on the plea that it controlled only 4 per cent of the steel and iron output. But he ignores the fact that it was the only company in the United States manufacturing steel rails in competition with the Steel Trust. And the newspaper reports at the time stated that as a result of the merger no further "cutting" would be made in the price of rails—a result that naturally would follow the trust's complete monopoly. If it was not a violation of the anti-trust law, why should the Steel Trust officials have consulted with Mr. Roosevelt and obtained his sanction to the deal? Obviously they knew that it violated the law and desired to obtain immunity. If it did not violate the anti-trust law, then the law utterly is without meaning or force. But it did violate the law and there is not a responsible lawyer in the United States, unless hired to express a contrary opinion, who would assent to Mr. Roosevelt's assertion that the merging of the Steel Trust's rival did not come within the prohibitions of the anti-trust statute. The fact is, the steel trust has been one of Mr. Roosevelt's "good" trusts. It is a tariff-sheltered trust, an infant industry, and its enfeebled

and helpless condition has appealed to his pity. For it not only has not been prosecuted for its past offenses, but its recent offenses have been condoned and pardoned before they have been committed.

+ +

Starving School Children.

El Paso (Texas) Daily News (Dem.), Oct. 2.—In the heart of the greatest food producing section of the greatest civilized country in the world children are slowly starving. . . . under the prolonged and unshaken reign of Republicanism, Protectionism and Dingleyism. . . . Something is radically wrong. . . . There is a disease in the economy of this Republic that will not yield to the witchery of "confidence" and that fails to heal with the application of all the cures of all the sages of conservatism. . . . The mills, the mines, the factories, the offices, the farms have been closed in the face of labor. Willing hands are idle. Yet there is work that needs to be done to feed the world. . . . Labor is out of a job. . . . The workman walks the streets for a job and the children go hungry to school. That the school children of Chicago, Pittsburg, New Ycrk and the great cities of the United States should go hungry to school and the hand of hunger reach in other parts of the country is an indictment against our civilization. . . . Privilege must go. Either that or our civilization must go. A sop thrown to privilege to be merciful and open the sources of livelihood to man will not suffice. Privilege and monopoly, twin sisters of iniquity, must be crushed with the heel of this nation as we would crush a serpent.

+ +

Why Land Valuation Bills.

London Daily News (Lib.), September 2.—Many appear to overlook the fact that valuation must precede taxation. Some clear and definite basis of value must be ascertained before a new tax can be imposed. That is why the Government are standing so firmly by the Land Valuation Bill for Scotland, in spite of the strenuous opposition of the Lords. We hope that we shall soon see the Valuation Bill for England and Wales. . . . One of the Tory Peers, Viscount Ridley, is reported as having said at Newcastle last year that "not far from a third of the land of the country is owned by the House of Lords in one way or another." We have seen calculations that make the extent of land owned by Peers even greater than that. But Lord Ridley's figures are sufficient for our purpose. Is it in the interest of the nation that about five hundred persons should have the power of saying that a third of the land in the country shall not be cultivated except as they choose; that none shall be available for the poor man's allotment; that cottages shall not be built; that plots shall not be acquired for larger dwellings; that preference shall be given to game preserves; and that nothing shall be done of which they do not approve? It is here that we find one of the keys to unemployment to-day. One of our correspondents points out that on his farm "every 17 acres supports its man." Yet thousands of acres of land are lying idle and thousands of men are clamoring for work and for land to till. No wonder the Peers are trying to put off land

valuation and taxation, and are crying for Tariff Reform instead. They know too well that taxation of land values means, at no distant time, the land for the people.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

THE WORKING GIRLS' SONG.

Dedicated by Miss Harriet Monroe to the Women's
Trade Union League.

Sisters of the whirling wheel
Are we all day;
Builders of a house of steel
On Time's highway;
Giving bravely, hour by hour,
All we have of youth and power.

Chorus:

Oh, lords of the house we rear,
Hear us, hear!
Green are the fields in May-time,
Grant us our love-time, play-time.
Short is the day and dear.

Fingers fly and engines boom
The livelong day,
Through far fields when roses bloom
The soft winds play.
Vast the work is—sound and true
Be the tower we build for you!

Chorus:

Oh, lords of the house we rear,
Hear us, hear!
Green are the fields in May-time,
Grant us our love-time, play-time.
Short is the day and dear.

Ours the future is—we face
The whole world's needs.
In our hearts the coming race
For life's joy pleads.
As you make us—slaves or free—
So the men unborn shall be.

Chorus:

Oh, lords of the house we rear,
Hear us, hear!
Green are the fields in May-time,
Grant us our love-time, play-time.
Short is the day and dear.

+ + +

PUZZLE—FIND THE THIEF.

"Thou Shalt Not Steal!"

Every passenger who doesn't pay his fare steals.
Every conductor who doesn't turn in fares collected
—steals.

—Car Sign.

"Thou shalt not steal."

Every street railway company that doesn't pay
living salaries—steals.

Every street railway company that doesn't give
transfers—steals.

Every street railway company that works its men
over hours—steals.

Every street railway company that charges a fare
for a standing passenger—steals.

Every street railway company that charges two
fares to Coney Island—steals.

"Thou shalt not steal."

—Life.

+ + +

VAN CLEAVE, TAFT, GOMPERS, BRYAN.

An Open Letter for Such as Will "Read, Mark, Learn,
and Inwardly Digest."

+

Austin Rotary Engine Company,
2nd Ave. & 8th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.,
Oct. 3, 1908.

Mr. James W. Van Cleave,
President National Association of Manufacturers,
St. Louis, Mo.

Dear Sir:—History affords no parallel for the wonderful unanimity on political matters you declare exists among "all the 142 national, State and local organizations leagued with the National Association of Manufacturers." One's surprise at the temerity of a perverse Congressional minority is increased by your assurance that the "great mass of the American people" were behind you at the Chicago convention. Your disclaimer, "there is no partisanship" in your association, is superfluous. Partisanship implies opposition. It is always the other fellow, he who opposes you, who is the "partisan." But the greatest surprise is: Why (with your assurance of this complete unanimity, 142 associations and the "great mass" of the people with you) does the national Republican committee maintain the pretense that there is a contest? Is it that Hitchcock needs the diversion before he enters the cabinet? Even so, why subject the ponderous Taft to an "undignified" emulation of his opponent's "demagogy" of rear-car campaigning. Why bother about the votes of the minor fraction outside your "great mass"? Are there not other exercises less fatiguing and repulsive to the heir apparent? Or are you and Hitchcock cruelly deceiving him into believing that Bryan "has a show"?

Did you work up this Macedonian cry, "Come over and help us," from the party leaders in the "rock-ribbed" Republican States, so that those who are being fried on Sheldon's griddle may get their money's worth, by having the candidate "put through his paces" for their delectation? But why with this all-pervading "unanimity" should they be separated from their shekels? Why is the money needed? Seemingly some are so foolish as not to comprehend it is mere by-play. They squeal at the Sheldon touch in these "panicky" times. Is it wise to bare that sore spot? Why not frankly admit the fight is a farce, that only a