

ment of Justice Edward Douglas White as chief justice of the supreme court by President Taft. 'What would Lee, the perfect type of a southerner, think if he were here today to hear that President Taft, a son of an abolitionist, a Yankee and the son of a Yankee, had appointed to the highest appointive office in the world, the chief justice of our supreme court, a hero who was a private in the southern army?' he said. 'Would it not make his heart glad to have seen it? The day of thanksgiving is here when a confederate veteran sits on the bench as chief justice of the supreme court of the United States, and I thank God that the day has come when the northern brother has come to do justice to the southern men. If Lee were alive, do you think any northern man, even the president, would have been fairer than he? Would he have let anyone be more generous than he? A northern congress had put Lee's statue in the hall of fame. I hope I would not seem disloyal to my father, who was buried in the gray uniform of the confederacy or to Georgia, the state which gave me birth and education, for me to say that we are just as true and good Americans as President Taft or any brother man of the northern states. I believe that the men of the north will teach their children to honor the greatest man of the south and that the men of the south will teach their children to honor the greatest man of the north. And I believe that the reunited women of the country will teach their children to honor the greatest men of the nation, and that they will look back upon one a southerner and a cavalier and the other a northerner and a commoner and do them honor as the greatest men of American history.'

CONCERNING ANNUITIES AND old age pensions, the Saturday Evening Post says: "Canada established postal savings banks forty years ago and now has about a hundred and sixty thousand depositors in such banks, with \$45,000,000 to their credit. Two years ago, as a further encouragement to thrift, the Dominion government began writing annuities. A Canadian aged twenty, say, may pay in twenty-five cents a week at any post-office and be assured of an annual income of eighty-five dollars at the age of fifty-five or of a hundred and thirty dollars at the age of sixty. He may pay in ten dollars a year and receive an annuity of a hundred dollars at the age of sixty. Four dollars and seventy-five cents a year paid in on account of a child five years old insures him a yearly income of a hundred dollars at the age of sixty. Payments may be made in any regular amounts at any regular intervals and the annuity will be whatever they produce, compounded at four per cent interest, free of expense. How many young men who are self-supporting at all could not spare twenty-five cents a week? The Canadian government makes nothing out of the plan—unless getting many people of small means into the habit of putting a little sum every week or month or quarter may be counted a national gain. We don't seem to count it so on this side of the border, but Canada is more interested in British affairs than we are; and consequently, no doubt, was more impressed by the spectacle of the British government appropriating many millions of pounds to pension aged and indigent citizens."

WRITING IN EVERYBODY'S Magazine, Frederick Townsend Martin, a New York millionaire, declares that the average employe in this country produces \$1,280 of wealth every year. Of this amount he gets \$437. The remainder, \$843, goes into the hands of other men, the capitalist or the exploiter of labor. Mr. Martin adds: "I do not mean to say that all the dividends and interest are gathered by the idle rich. Such a condition as that can exist only once in the history of the nation. It came about in Rome—and it led to the fall. It came about in France—and it led to the terror. Here in America it has gone far, to be sure, and the tendency is onward; but it has not yet reached a point where we can say 'tomorrow the harvest is ripe.' For thirty years we have been piling up wealth in the hands of men who do not work. It has gone so far that today, in every city in the union, the class of idle rich has reached proportions that, to the thoughtful student, are alarming. Machinery, instead of emancipating the worker, has welded chains of industrial slavery about their necks. The fruit of invention is plucked by the hands of the few. The once powerful middle class, which is the safety of every nation, is weak and is every day declining. When the nineteenth century closed America worshipped wealth. It

sanctified its possessors. It deifies the multimillionaires. Plutocracy is disgorging, but public opinion is relentless. With trumpet and drum and black banners flying, came the army of muckrakers. And their revelations made the nation heartsick. We can no longer blind ourselves with the outworn boast that the American workingman is the highest paid artisan in the world. We know those lying figures too well. We are learning that what we give the workers in wares, we took back from them in the higher cost of necessities, in food, in clothing, in medicines, in insurance, in a hundred devious ways, all with one tendency to keep the living margin down. Today we of the class that rules, that draws unearned profits from the toil of other men, know full well that the time is almost here when there must be a true accounting."

“WHAT PRIVILEGE MEANS in England,” is the title of an interesting article, printed in the New York World. The World writer says: "An American in London, seeing in the house of lords a small body of men, distinguished in appearance and of good ability, discussing public questions in a dignified manner, may wonder at the outcry against them. In fact, the house of lords is a body of some 600 members, less than 100 of whom attend to their duties. There were "wild lords" in the crisis last winter who asked of policemen their way to their seats. Nor is the average lord an able man, as compared with the commons. This would matter little, since only the ablest peers commonly attend debates, if they were not representative solely of special interests. The house is not even an aristocratic body in family and lineage, since the old peerages constantly die out. A family so recent as the Pitts won four peerages; all are extinct. Not one of the marquises antedates our revolution. Less than one-third of the earls do so. From 1800 to 1907 376 peerages were created. From 1857 to 1907 123 tory peers were made and 92 liberal peers, half of whom afterward turned tories. A few new peers are scientists, soldiers and statesmen. But most of them are irremovable Guggenheims, Scotts and Penroses, mere men of privilege. Alsopp's ale, Bass's ale and Gilbey's whiskeys have peers. Guinness's stout has two. The Rothschilds, Lubbocks and other financial houses have peers by the score. Tory newspaper-owners are ennobled; and also one who owns both tory and liberal papers. Recalling the scandalous origin of many peerages, the natural son of a lord was ennobled so late as 1859. Two archbishops and twenty-four bishops sit as lords spiritual, representing a minority but legislating for the majority, at salaries of \$15,000 to \$75,000 a year, which are a public charge. The consequences in daily life of this union of the church, the saloon, entailed land and big business to control public business are to an American mind amazing. We may name three examples. First—the support, by taxation, of a state church in England and Wales, but not in Ireland, where the lords long blocked disestablishment. Second—The taxation of land upon its income, not its value, making it possible to check the growth of a village or even depopulate it and pay farm taxes on land needed for habitation. Third—The huge national folly of permitting a mere license to sell liquors to acquire property value, so that even the proposal to acquire and close saloons at fourteen years' purchase is denounced in pulpits and on platforms as "confiscation." Upon the other side, the peers have opposed as long as they dared, every attempt to alleviate the political and industrial condition of workingmen, except when the cynical Disraeli 'caught the liberals bathing and stole their clothes.' Is it any wonder that a finally emancipated British people propose to 'end or mend' the house of privilege?"

THE ADMONITION, "bear ye one another's burdens," was well obeyed in New York City recently and the story is told by the New York World in this way: "A boy three and a half years old stood crying at the corner of One Hundred and Fifth street and Third avenue about 7 o'clock last night. He had light hair, blue eyes, and was dressed in a dark gray military suit, with black leather belt, black shoes and white stockings. His little gray cap was pulled down over his eyes, and though he strove manfully not to cry the tears persisted in trickling down his rosy cheeks. Down the avenue another little boy came trudging. He was about five years old, and also wore a gray suit and gray overcoat. His shoes and stockings were black and his black peak cap was pushed

jauntily back on his head. He was trying his best to whistle. When the elder of the boys spied the younger one crying he paused and watched the little fellow for a moment. The boy was a stranger to him and at first he did not know what to do. But as the child's sobs continued he threw formality to the winds and, running over, put his arms about the boy and asked, 'What's the matter?' 'I'm losted,' sobbed the child. 'I'm losted too,' said the elder boy, 'but don't cry; I'll take care of you.' He petted the other one and comforted him as best he could. After a few minutes the smaller boy took heart in the consoling words of the stranger and stopped crying. 'I'm losted to,' repeated the elder, 'and you come with me and we'll find a policeman.' Hand in hand the boys started down the avenue, and at One Hundred and Fourth street they found Policeman Donohue. 'We're both losted,' said the elder boy. Donohue asked them many questions, but was unable to learn their names or anything about them. They were sent to the Children's society."

REFERRING TO the New York word contest the Chicago Record-Herald says: "A contest conducted by an eastern branch of the Y. M. C. A. for determining the twenty-five most beautiful words in the English language was won by a young man who cannily made up his list from such vocables as these: Melody, splendor, adoration, eloquence, virtue, innocence, modesty, faith, joy, honor, radiance, nobility, sympathy, heaven, love, divine, hope, harmony, happiness, purity and liberty. That is to say the victor selected words for their meaning rather than for their sound. He appealed to association rather than to the ear. But is 'hope,' to the impartial auditor, more melodious than 'soap?' Is the auricular address of 'splendor' more alluring than that of 'spender?' Is not 'infernal' as musical as 'divine?' Is not 'servitude' more mellifluous than 'liberty?' Would 'faith,' with its th-sound, or 'innocence,' with its clash of final s's, make any kind of appeal to the non-English ear? Recent efforts in England along these same lines have brought back into notice 'that blessed word 'Mesopotamia,' along with many high-sounding geographical appellations employed by Milton. The words 'amber' and 'nightingale' have also had their ardent supporters. It seems, after all, as if a 'beautiful' word must fulfill three requirements: It must sound well to the ear, it must print well to the eye, and most important of all—it must enjoy long consecrated connotations. A fourth requirement that it should sound well to the fastidious ear of a man unacquainted with the language to which it belongs, might be too rigorous. Of all these requirements, that of racial association and appeal seems to be the most important, and it is apparently on such grounds that the contestant whose list we give carried off the prize."

PRESIDENT TAFT, in a letter dated December 29, 1910 and read in three thousand Sunday schools in the United States sounded the keynote of a total abstainers' movement. The letter is addressed to Sunday school pupils as "My Dear Young Friends," and reads: "The excessive use of intoxicating liquor is the cause of a great deal of the poverty, degradation and crime of the world, and one who abstains from the use of such liquor avoids a dangerous temptation. Abraham Lincoln showed that he believed this, in writing out for his boy friends the pledge of total abstinence, so often quoted. Each person must determine for himself the course he will take in reference to his tastes and appetites; but those who exercise the self-restraint to avoid altogether the temptation of alcoholic liquor are on the safe and wiser path."

THE HUNTSVILLE (Alabama) Daily Times prints this editorial: "There is no denying the fact that William Jennings Bryan is the most potent factor in the democratic party today. The party has many big men but none of them have been able to hold out and keep themselves before the public as has Mr. Bryan. He is a man with distinctly ideas of his own and what he has to say will largely shape the next democratic platform. In three presidential defeats Mr. Bryan has risen bigger in the estimation of his friends and the public all the while. The principles he has advocated were taken up and enunciated by the republicans. Mr. Bryan is about ten years ahead of his or any contending party. He is one of our greatest American citizens."