

a conclusion would see a demand for arbitrary regulation by law in a claim that some people eat more than is needful. What it does mean is that workers ought to get what justly belongs to them, and then those who care to work no longer hours than enough to ensure them a good living will find four hours sufficient. Today an unjust economic system compels many of them to work much longer for a poor living. To point out that four hours a day would be ample is to declare that the worker is deprived of his just share. Mrs. Fels has a definite program of action which will ensure justice to the laborer and thus make it possible for those who want to work no more than four hours a day to so limit their time and still be able to live well. Has the Worcester Gazette as much?

S. D.



### Repeal the Anti-Labor Laws.

The industrial depression is attributed by protected interests to legislation which curbs their unfair privileges; by railroads to legislation which interferes with their predatory practices; by telephone interests to measures taken to curb their power, and by the plunderbund generally to legislation ostensibly aimed at oppressive methods. It seems about time for Labor and unprivileged Business to see and explain that the cause is due to legislation which puts them at the mercy of Monopoly. There were panics and depressions before there was interference with protective tariff laws, or with predatory habits of railroads and trusts. But every panic or depression, of which we have any record, occurred while laws were in force interfering with useful labor. There will continue to be depressions as long as production of wealth may only take place by permission of the class that controls natural resources, and while industry and its products are subject to taxation. The laws upholding those conditions are in fact anti-Labor laws. They constitute the most inexcusable and pernicious antilegislation on the statute books. Their repeal is the step that should be urged to put an end to industrial depressions.

S. D.



### Working for Each Other.

Mr. Hutchins Hapgood, the novelist, made a shrewd observation when he said, speaking of labor conditions:

The workman will never again work well until he works for himself. He used to believe that God, the king, the autocrats, legitimately commanded him to work. He believed in authority and worked well.

He no longer believes in authority; and handicrafts, trades, and mechanical arts will never again be good until the worker works for himself and can express himself in his work.

This is a feature that few of those who delve into the causes of industrial unrest appreciate. They say, speaking abstractedly, that capitalists work for labor, as much as labor works for capital. But the concrete situation gives to their words about the same meaning as attaches to the mouthings of a United States Senator, when he speaks of himself as a servant of the people.



Capital and Labor are partners. They do work for each other. Too often, however, the Capitalist has allied himself with Monopoly; and as an individual he assumes the power of Monopoly under the guise of Capital. And the Laborer, discriminating no more between the two than the Capitalist himself, bitterly resents this assumption of superiority. The direction of industry, and the management of affairs, is assumed entirely by the Capitalist; and while he realizes that he himself is helpless without the co-operation of Labor, he knows that Labor must bow to immediate necessity, and so yield to his dictation. The remedy for this state of affairs does not lie necessarily in Labor's control of industry; but it does demand that Labor be so independent that the worker can freely withhold his services from any enterprise of course that does not meet with his approval. Capital today dictates terms to Labor, not as Capital, but as Monopoly. Destroy the Monopoly, and Labor and Capital will stand upon an equal footing. For, if the natural opportunities for industry be thrown open alike to Labor and Capital, Labor will be freed from the necessity of accepting the preferred terms of Capital; and will be able to negotiate as an equal. The Capitalist being deprived of his present privilege, and compelled to deal with laborers who are not under the immediate necessity of working for him, will be obliged to share, not only the product of the joint efforts of Capital and Labor, but the honor and responsibility as well.



The essence of the working man's idea of working for himself, as set forth by Mr. Hapgood, does not lie in the elimination of the Capitalist as a manager, but as a beneficiary of special privilege. If Labor itself controlled the industry, it would have to employ a manager, and gather together tools and materials; and it may well be doubted if the wisest labor organization could do this as effi-

ciently as would result under free competition, when monopoly privileges have been withdrawn. With this fair and even relation between employer and employe—and the terms will be interchangeable, for it will be as proper to call the present employer the employe, and the employe the employer—the so-called wage earner will be working for himself. He will joy in his work, and “handicrafts, trades, and mechanical arts” will be raised to the highest degree of excellence. S. C.



### Rebates and Service.

An interesting point came to light recently when a Chicago business man related his experience with the railroads. In the good old days when the freight solicitor called, there was never any question about the rates, but much haggling over the rebate to be allowed; and the solicitor who could give the largest rebate got the freight. When rebates were prohibited by law, the roads offered other inducements to get the freight, the chief of which was better service. So long as the shipper's chief interest lay in securing the largest possible rebate he gave little attention to service; and two weeks was good time to make between New York and Chicago. But no sooner had rebates been denied him, and he found himself upon the same footing as other shippers, than he listened to the man who promised to shorten the time of freight delivery. The competition of roads that had formerly run rebates to such a high point now reduced the time of delivery to the shortest interval; and the same shipment which before had taken two weeks was now delivered in three days. No sooner had rates and fares on the roads become uniform, than there was competition as to speed in freights and safety in passengers. S. C.



### Trying the Same Game Twice.

That the eastern railroads practised deception when asking for permission to increase freight rates, should now be clear even to the gullible ones who believed them. They promised that the increase would be followed by general prosperity. Of course nothing of the kind has happened. Now they are trying to have repealed the full crew laws that several States have enacted. It may be that there are facts which show that these laws should be repealed. But if so there should be others than railroad representatives to vouch for them. Having made misstatements to get one concession how can anyone be sure that the same policy is not being pursued by the same interests

to get another concession? Legislators should beware. The same applies to the effort now being made by the western roads for a rate increase. The Interstate Commerce Commission has allowed itself to be deceived once within the year by the railroad corporations. Perhaps that was the railroads' fault. But it will be the Commission's fault if it lets itself be fooled twice by the same interests. S. D.



### How Some Railroad Income Is Used.

That the railroads worked against a change in railway mail pay legislation during the recent session of Congress is the charge made by Postmaster General Burleson. Mr. Burleson undoubtedly has good authority for the statement. The railroads succeeded not only in preventing any change in the present unscientific method of fixing compensation for carrying the mails, but defeated the entire post office appropriation. Work of that kind is expensive. Now the railroads are putting up a poverty plea before the Interstate Commerce Commission and some of the State public utility commissions, claiming big expenses and insufficient income, and asking power to increase rates. A sufficient answer would be that since they are using their present incomes to defeat necessary reforms and to embarrass the Government, it would be contrary to public policy to increase their income that they may have more to spend for such purposes. S. D.



### Criticizing the Press.

The flare-up of Charles R. Miller, editor of the New York Times, before the Ship Purchase Lobby Inquiry Committee, is in questionable taste, even if it does not contravene good morals. His objection that inquisitorial proceedings of that kind would have a marked tendency to reduce the press of the United States to the level of the press of some of the capitals of European countries does not seem to be well taken. It should not be within the power of the Government to suppress a newspaper, or to compel it to publish this or that piece of news or editorial opinion; but it may compel it to display its colors. A paper, for instance, that advocates sugar bounties, might be required to show whether it was financed by the Sugar Trust, or other financial beneficiary. A newspaper is not a private institution in the sense that a store or a factory is. It is in a sense a public agent, subsidized by the Government with a nominal rate of postage. It is one of those forces that grows with the growth of society, that may be restrained by