

crowded East Side and put better housing accommodations within reach of the poor. It is not as far-reaching a measure as should be adopted, but is a move in the right direction. But it will also affect unfavorably the profits of those who hold valuable land out of use or only put it to partial use. This clearly weighs more heavily than any question of public welfare with the Times, the Allied Real Estate Interests and the others who are moving heaven and earth to prevent even a popular expression on the matter. If their efforts at opposition succeed they cannot escape moral responsibility for the result. Every victim who this year contracts tuberculosis because forced by poverty to live in crowded, unsanitary quarters in New York City may justly attribute his misfortune to opponents of the Herrick-Schaap bill. The mother of every infant driven to a premature death will have good cause to remember what these respectable Tories have done. The poor of New York City have a valid moral claim for support this year from the individuals, organizations and newspapers that have declared as "unfit to be voted on" a slight effort to make it possible for them to help themselves.

S. D.



### A Rejected Opportunity.

The National Conference on Unemployment met in New York City on February 27 and 28. Its object was supposed to be to find some solution of the unemployed problem. If so, it has failed. According to reports most of its time was taken up with discussion of the establishment of national labor exchanges or employment agencies. Such institutions are useful enough, but however efficiently conducted they may be they can not give labor access to unused opportunities. In commenting on the conference's failure a Pittsburgh correspondent remarks: "I can stand on my roof and throw stones on twenty-five good jobs. They are all in sight and they are all vacant, and I don't need anybody to find them for me. All I need is permission to use my hands on them." How such jobs could be made available to labor there were competent men ready to explain to the conference. The Manhattan Singletax Club had asked for just twenty minutes to present a constructive proposal to that effect and was refused. Why, is not evident. Surely the program might easily have been arranged to permit it. Through this denial the conference threw away an opportunity to perform a valuable service to the unemployed.

S. D.

### The Masses and the Associated Press.

Whether it shall be safe for a paper—especially a small, weak one—to criticize a powerful corporation, will be determined by the outcome of proceedings brought by the Associated Press against The Masses, the illustrated Socialist weekly. For publishing a cartoon charging that corporation with coloring the news the editor and artist have been indicted for criminal libel. However unreasonable these criminal proceedings may be, to effectively fight them requires a defense fund and an appeal for help is made by The Masses. The issue is not what will become of the threatened newspapermen, but whether an attempt will succeed "to put down by force of legal procedure the few free and independent critics of the Associated Press." If it should become unsafe to criticize the principal dispenser of news in this country, then every monopoly and grafting institution will be protected against publicity.

S. D.



### Which Is the Better Way?

Last week a man of great wealth passed away. He was one to whom fortune had been most generous; for, while yet a young man, he inherited a large fortune, and though he gave little attention to business that fortune had increased five-fold before his death. He was a modest man, who eschewed the follies of society, and spent his energies in the creation of a fine country estate. He acquired 100,000 acres of land in the mountains of North Carolina, spent a million dollars in leveling and grading a mountain, and erected thereon a house of 236 rooms. The house and grounds are said to be among the finest in the world. But he did more than this. He raised blooded stock on his model farms, and propagated rare plants and trees. And the newspaper obituaries contain the significant and all-embracing phrase: "He had a number of charities."



It may be said of this man that he lived according to his light. Yet how different his life from that of Joseph Fels! With a fortune many times greater he was content to accept a fabulous toll from his fellow men, and give in return—charity. A sop to charity was sufficient, as he viewed his responsibilities, to discharge his debt to that army of men, women, and children whose toil created his income. There might be long hours at nerve-racking labor, and hard fare of insufficient nutrition. Wages of grown men might be too small to keep a family, and children might be sent into