

men about the Man of Galilee in Brother Bruce's mission hall.

For some of us, who are still simple enough in spirit to believe in the things we were taught as children, it is a source of strength to know that men of big minds and wide experience, men who have tested life in many of its phases, share our faith and return with assurance of being satisfied to the old, old story, that, through centuries of telling, retains its power to touch and quicken the soul.—Louisville (Ky.) Herald.

DOUBTS ABOUT THE COMPENSATION BILL

That only fifteen United States senators could be found to vote against the Sutherland-Brantley bill may be sufficient proof of the convincing quality of the arguments advanced by the men who framed the measure, the president who urged its passage, and the labor and other organizations which have put themselves on record as favoring it. But it does not conceal the fact that serious criticisms of this particular device for compensating injured workmen have been coming from those who might be expected to approve it, and who do approve the thing it stands for. The provisions of the Sutherland bill, which was carefully drawn by a specially appointed and supposedly expert commission, were outlined in our issue of March 2. As our readers will remember, such common-law defenses as the fellow-servant and contributory-negligence doctrines are done away with, expensive and delaying litigation is cut off, and a definite compensation scheme is worked out. The measure applies to common carriers in foreign and interstate business and in the District of Columbia, and supersedes and is exclusive of all other state and federal laws on the subject. It advocates, including Senators Root and Chamberlain on the floor of the senate, contend that it is admirably fitted to accomplish the ends desired and if passed "will be a benefit not only to the laboring men and the industries in which they are employed, but to the people of the country as a whole."

The house ought to follow the senate in passing it, thinks the Springfield Republican, for—

"The Sutherland-Brantley bill has received powerful and wide-spread indorsement. The national civic federation has made great efforts to promote its prospects of enactment. It has been strongly approved by the brotherhood of locomotive engineers, the order of railway conductors, and the brotherhood of railway trainmen. The bill was framed after exhaustive study of English and German legislation on the same subject and, within the limitations of our dual system of government, it applies all the best features of foreign systems to our interstate railroads.

* * * With such a law on the federal statute-book, there would be during the coming presidential campaign very tangible evidence that,

under the American system of government, notwithstanding its constitutional checks and balances, progressive legislation, in behalf of the toilers and demanded by the spirit of the age, can be secured without delays that become intolerable to all decent and disinterested people."

But the New York American, a newspaper which can generally be depended on to take a firm stand on behalf of the working people, "appeals to the democratic house of representatives to stop the progress of this bill until the workmen's side of the case has had a more considerable hearing." Likewise a number of the senatorial opponents of the Sutherland bill, all progressive, urge delay for the same reason. Senator Reed wants the labor organizations of the country to get "a fair opportunity to examine it." Senator Hoke Smith thinks some of the new remedies provided are "difficult and circuitous" and that the abolition of old remedies works against the real interests of railroad-workers. Other objections are: that the heavy insurance will compel railroad men to increase their cost of living; that the present employers' liability act is displaced; that litigation is taken from the state courts and put finally into the hands of one man; that there can be no state provision to supersede or supplement it, and that all that can be recovered is what this act provides for; and, finally, to quote the Atlanta Journal of Labor, the maximum damages allowed "are grossly and grotesquely inadequate." The Journal of Commerce at one time denounced the bill as unfair to the railroads, but it later admits that there has been little opposition to it from this source; which is one of the things to convince the New York American "that the railroad officials had the ear of the commission and that the railroad employees had not."

The theory of this legislation, the New York World believes, "is bound to become more and more a definite policy of government." In essence, it is "that the industrial worker should receive some compensation for his injuries corresponding to the soldier's pension for wounds incurred in battle." The World quotes Senator Chamberlain's vivid statement in debate that "every six minutes, day and night, a railroad employee is killed or injured, and every two hours one is killed," and goes on:

"When men in war are killed or wounded in such numbers the whole nation hangs breathless on the news from the front. Yet the greater disablement of men in peaceful industry excites only a casual interest, though it goes on year after year with a mounting list of the killed and maimed. And not only on the railroads but in the mines, shops, and factories the country over do the appalling casualties of peace occur. In one year, among the 5,600,000 male industrial employees in the United States, 208,300 suffered death or temporary disablement, 34,785 were permanently disabled, and

the ratio of accidents was practically double that among employees in mercantile pursuits.

"Inventors of machine-guns and rapid-fire cannon have been charged with increasing the carnage of war. Not so much account has been taken of the increase of industrial carnage due to mechanical invention. Yet the inventors of the dynamo and the trolley-car, of the locomotive and of all the machinery of modern indus-

try are responsible for an enormous multiplication of the hazards of employment. With every step in inventional progress, life is made less safe for the operative, and it is only within very recent times that the recognition has come of society's duty to protect its members and indemnify them against the mortality of industry as much as to satisfy their claims for disability in war."—Literary Digest.

Disfranchising a Socialist

With surprising unanimity both the radicals and the conservatives of the press fall upon the action of United States District Judge Hanford of the state of Washington in canceling the naturalization papers of Leonard Oleson because he "admitted that he is a socialist." "There seems to be some uncertainty whether Oleson was deprived of his citizenship after his naturalization had been completed, or whether the decision prevented the final steps towards naturalization being taken," says the Springfield Republican (Ind.); "but in either case Judge Hanford has grossly abused his power." The same paper goes on to say that in case Oleson was already a citizen, the judge "has made himself liable to impeachment, but that if the other supposition is true, probably nothing can be done to reverse the action, for the law on naturalization gives a United States judge considerable latitude and discretion in determining each case as it comes before him."

It appears from the latest advices that Oleson was actually deprived of his citizenship after having been granted a certificate of naturalization. "If Judge Hanford's amazing ruling were upheld, it would mean that a man's citizenship would be forfeited because of his political opinions," notes the New York Evening Mail (prog. rep.), which does not "recall a more glaring instance of judicial tyranny nor one better calculated to strengthen the movement for the recall of judges." "Socialism grows on such incidents," remarks the New York Tribune (rep.), and the Philadelphia North American (prog. rep.), brands it "a judicial iniquity." "I believe Judge Hanford should be impeached for this act," declares Victor Berger, socialist congressman. The Washington delegates to the socialist national convention, in session in Indianapolis, insist, according to the correspondents, that this ruling is "the beginning of a struggle to disfranchise foreign-born citizens of the Pacific slope because of the growing strength of socialism there," and one dispatch states that it is "accepted by the rank and file as the opening gun of a general campaign against socialism in America."

Judge Hanford gives to the press the following statement in defense of his ruling:

"Oleson admitted that he is a socialist, a frequenter of assemblages of socialists in which he participates as a speaker, advocating a propaganda for radical changes in the institutions of the country. He claimed to have a clear understanding of the constitution of the United States, and to have known that, by one of its articles, deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process of law is forbidden, and yet the evidence introduced in his behalf proved that the party with which he is affiliated, and whose principles he advocates, has for its main object the complete elimination of property rights in this country.

"He expressed himself as being willing for people to retain their money, but insisting that all the

land, buildings, and industrial institutions should become the common property of all the people, which object is to be attained, according to his belief, by use of the power of the ballot, and when that object shall have been attained, the political government of the country will be entirely abrogated because there will be no use for it.

"The notion that citizens of this country may absolve themselves from allegiance to the constitution of the United States otherwise than by expatriation, is a dangerous heresy. The nation, recognizing the principle of the law of self-preservation, restricts the privilege of becoming naturalized to those whose sentiments are compatible with genuine allegiance to the existing government, as defined by the oath which they are required to take. Those who believe in the propagation of crude theories, hostile to the constitution, are barred.

"In order to secure a certificate of naturalization he intentionally made representations to the court which necessarily deceived the court, or his application for naturalization would have been denied. Therefore, by the petition which he was required to file, and his testimony at the final hearing of his application, and by taking the oath which was administered to him in open court, he perpetrated a fraud upon the United States, and committed an offense for which he may be punished as provided by law. The case, therefore, comes clearly within the provision of the law requiring the court to set aside and cancel his certificate of naturalization, and it was so decreed."

This ruling, according to a dispatch from Washington, D. C., is entirely approved by officials of the division of naturalization in the department of commerce and labor, who predict that it will be sustained by the supreme court in case of appeal. The Philadelphia Public Ledger (ind.) and the Boston Christian Science Monitor both remind us that naturalization is not a right but a privilege, and the Washington Times (ind.) comes to Judge Hanford's defense in the following words:

"If we understand the case correctly, the judicial action was not taken because Oleson was a socialist, but because he announced himself opposed to the constitution and the institutions of this country.

"Within the same week naturalization papers were refused to an Italian by a New York authority because the applicant said in event of a war between this country and Italy he would take up arms against this country. Yet nothing was said about that ruling. * * *

"This nation must always remain the asylum of the persecuted, the harbor of free speech and free thought, but that does not carry with it the proposition that it must be made the spawning-ground of ideas and parties which, if permitted to grow, would destroy the very institutions whose protection and freedom they now claim.

"If a man does not believe in this nation, its institutions, and its flag, he certainly has no business here,

10 Beautiful Post Cards Sent to You FREE

Will you accept Ten (10) Beautiful Colored Post Cards which I will mail to you without cost?

For a short time only, I am giving away Ten Post Cards Free of Cost with every order for My Big Packet of 25 Elegant Post Cards at my special price of only 25 cents. This packet of cards is extra fine, the greatest post card bargain ever offered. Think of it, 25 exquisitely colored cards, no two alike, in beautiful floral and friendship designs, for only 25 cents—cards that sell at two for 5 cents in retail stores.

Order this Big Packet at once at my special price of 25 cents (stamps or coin), and I will include ten extra post cards free if your order reaches me within 10 days. Do not let this offer go by—send today.

Walters, Post Card Man, 2245 Vine St., Lincoln, Neb