

South Carolina are less than twelve years old, and in another factory twenty-five per cent. are of the same tender age.

A committee of five South Carolina mill-owners—one of them a member of the United States Industrial Commission—went to the legislature and protested against any legislation which should prohibit child labor, saying that such legislation would be a recognition of the labor unions of the State, and therefore not advisable! Hugh Kavanaugh, in the *San Francisco Star*, tells of one town he visited where among 400 children less than 100 attend school. "The mill calls all the children whenever it needs them," the school teacher told Mr. Kavanaugh. Some of these work at night in the mills. Who would not rather see the children of the nation chattel slaves in the average condition that prevailed before the war?

---

Perhaps Mr. Mark Hanna is sincere in his sudden interest in the labor question. It is not necessary to think him a liar when he speaks in behalf of labor; nor a hypocrite when he protests his willingness to consider the demands of labor unions. It is true his conversion comes rather late, and the example of Tom L. Johnson in Ohio naturally attracts imitators. But though appearances are suspicious, let us not impute motives. If Mr. Mark Hanna has something of importance to say, let us accept it at its face value.

In his Chautauqua address the distinguished Republican Senator said:

"I know the tendency in this country and the world over has been to selfishly appropriate the larger parts of the benefits of industry to capital."

There has been no such tendency. If there were, we should find that capital was growing richer, but as a matter of fact, monopoly is growing richer, and (relatively to the increase in production) both capital and labor are growing poorer.

Speaking, too, of the laboring masses, he says, "We must give them a larger share of the profits of industry which they helped to create." There is something offensive—perhaps unconsciously so—in that word "we." And this insistence upon the Golden Rule! What has it got to do with the question? If it is true that, as Senator Hanna says, "Labor is not getting its own," why should those who are now appropriating the larger fruits of labor generously turn over a part of it to the laborers and felicitate themselves on the practice of Christian Charity. When a man is robbed it will not do to urge the practice of the Golden Rule upon the thief, and ask him to restore a portion of the stealings—it is a case for the police. And though the analogy is not in all things perfect, since the system by which Labor is robbed of so much of its own is a social, not an individual crime, it is obviously a call for repression, and not for preachments upon the Golden Rule between individual capitalists and laborers.

Yet for society as a whole, we may well invoke the Golden Rule. Would Mr. Mark Hanna accept its provisions in the matter of land tenure where each man should be treated alike in the laws? And would he still favor it if we should adopt the Golden Rule in matters of taxation? And what about public franchises, by which Mr. Hanna has grown so enormously rich? Is he willing that society shall adopt the practice of doing for John Smith and every individual of the community equally what in the matter of such privileges it has done for Mark Hanna? We fear he would shrink from the logic of his own preachments.

---

United States Commissioner of Labor Carrol D. Wright, in his address on "Labor in Law" at the New York Chautauqua Assembly, after referring