

has already made too dangerous and deep."

The interests of the men and of the citizenship of the country, however, are not the only reasons for the abolition of the twelve-hour day. Strong reasons are also found in the interests of the industry itself. The twelve-hour day means sluggish work; it means the prevention of measures for making labor in the steel industry efficient; it develops indifference and inattentiveness that inevitably result in costly accidents; it creates what Mr. Drury terms the "lax moral tone which must pervade an industry where sleeping is tolerated;" it calls for foremen who feel that they must drive in order to get anything done; it makes for waste, including the unnecessary impairment of tools and equipment. "Who will deny," asks Mr. Drury, "that in the long run a brighter future is bound to lie before an industry which has learned that work is work, and has decided that long dull hours and half-asleep workmen will no longer do?"

The arguments for the abolition of the twelve-hour day thus based on reason are reinforced by experience. Some steel mills in America have changed from the twelve-hour to the eight-hour day. It is impossible here to report the evidence that Mr. Drury marshals; but the conclusion is plain that the change is not impracticable, for it has worked. It is true that it has resulted in some increase in the cost of production; but that increase is slight. That increase in cost in pig iron that sells for \$40 a ton would amount to only 21 cents; and on the steel ingot that sells for about \$46 that increase would be only about 46 cents; and there are steel manufacturers, according to Mr. Drury, who believe that under the three-shift system steel will not cost any more ultimately, and perhaps not as much.

It is not without significance that, except in the Orient, practically all other great steel manufacturing countries (Britain, Belgium, France, Germany, Sweden, Spain, Italy) have abandoned the twelve-hour day.

The change to the shorter working day is surely coming. The only question is the method of the change. It is better to have it come without turmoil and industrial warfare. It is better to have it come under the direction of men who know the steel industry, rather than under the direction of men who are ignorant of it. It is better to have it come by the voluntary action of the industry rather than through political pressure. And it is better to have it come at a time when there is a dearth of employment, and when workmen will therefore more easily adjust themselves to the change because they will through the

change find more jobs. This is the time when circumstances seem specially fitted for a reform that has in it possibilities of benefit alike to the workingman, the employer, and the country.

THE CASE OF ATTORNEY-GENERAL DAUGHERTY

TWO charges against Mr. Daugherty, Attorney-General of the United States, have been made on the floor of the Senate and widely repeated in the newspapers. The first is that in his connection with the notorious Morse case he displayed a low standard of legal ethics; the second is that he has



(C) Harris & Ewing
ATTORNEY-GENERAL DAUGHERTY

been lax and partial in his prosecution of fraudulent war contract cases. The least important of these charges, the second, has received the greater emphasis. In our judgment, he must stand or fall upon the first charge.

So far as we have been able to discover, the accusation that Mr. Daugherty has shown personal, financial, or political favoritism in his official attitude towards fraudulent war contracts is based upon mere suspicion, rumor, and gossip. The Attorney-General indignantly denies this charge, concerning which no direct evidence has been published, and has announced over his own name that a special division of the Department of Justice has been organized for the trial of these cases; that expert and distinguished lawyers have been engaged to aid in the work; and that the prosecution will be carried on vigorously without fear or favor. Any judgment as to his impartiality in these cases ought

to be suspended until the cases are tried and he can show what he is able and willing to do as a prosecutor. The Attorney-General is at least entitled to the protection afforded to any common criminal by the principles of constitutional law. He is entitled to be regarded as innocent of collusion with fraud until he is proved guilty.

The charge regarding Mr. Daugherty's standards of legal ethics is, however, more serious. It concerns character, and not legal acts. It depends, therefore, not upon technical evidence, but upon personal judgments and valuations.

On May 22 Senator Caraway read into the "Record" on the floor of the Senate a long letter purporting to have been written and signed by Thomas B. Felder, a New York lawyer, in which Mr. Daugherty's connection with the Morse case is outlined as follows. The italics are ours:

To begin at the beginning, permit me to say that after Charles W. Morse was sent to the penitentiary at Atlanta, Georgia, under a fifteen-year sentence, and after his attorneys and family had exhausted every resource that they possessed or ingenuity could suggest, Hon. Fred L. Seely, then the editor and proprietor of the Atlanta "Georgian," who had, as I understood it, a benevolent and charitable interest in the fate of Morse, and who had been for some years theretofore a client of mine, came to my office and stated to me that I had convinced him of my resourcefulness and my capacity to "do things," and, while the Morse situation seemed hopeless, because the President had refused, on the best showing that could be made, either commutation or pardon, yet he had desired me to examine thoroughly the record and if in my judgment anything could be done he would cause me to be employed in the case and would see that I was substantially compensated for services rendered in proportion to their value to Mr. Morse.

I read the record, studied the case thoroughly, got in touch with Mr. H. M. Daugherty, of Columbus, Ohio, who stood as close to the President as any other lawyer or citizen of the United States, and interested him in the case, agreeing to divide with him any compensation that I might receive. We took the matter up with the Attorney-General and with the President, stating to them that the record disclosed that in refusing to extend Executive clemency reasons were given which were not borne out by the record and we requested that the case be reopened.

We were informed by the President and the Attorney-General that the act of the President rendered the matter a "closed incident" for the present, but if we would bring the matter to their attention again just before the term of office of the President expired in March, 1913, the matter would be reopened and perhaps a different action taken in respect thereto.

This decision was communicated by

Mr. H. M. Daugherty and myself to Mr. Morse, who had agreed to pay \$6,000 cash to cover expenses (this sum was paid) and \$25,000, conditional upon our obtaining his release from the penitentiary.

When this result was reported to Mr. Morse, he stated to us in the presence of the penitentiary guard that if we would renew our efforts to obtain his release he would pay us, in addition to the amount agreed upon, the sum of \$100,000, and exclaimed, "Gentlemen, I will make you both rich if you will get me out of here."

The Felder letter goes on to say that after Morse was pardoned, owing to the efforts of Mr. Daugherty, he (Felder) and Mr. Daugherty received \$6,000 in cash and \$25,000 in worthless stocks; that Mr. Daugherty "complained very bitterly of our treatment by Morse" and after a personal interview with Morse "positively and emphatically declined to take the stocks either in payment or as collateral security" and insisted on a better form of cash.

In this letter Mr. Felder makes the naïve statement, apparently without in the least appreciating what it means, that Mr. Daugherty sold to Morse, a convicted criminal of unsavory reputation, his political influence with President Taft for \$31,000 and a possibility of a much larger sum.

Nearly a week elapsed before Mr. Daugherty made any reply to the Felder letter. He then wrote to Senator Watson, of Indiana, making no protest against or denial of Felder's narrative of his relations with Morse, but simply saying: "All I ever received from anybody in connection with the Morse cases, both civil and criminal, was about \$4,000."

The office of Attorney-General of the United States is one of the most important in the structure of our government. The entire system of justice, in a sense, rests upon it. Its incumbents ought to be, not merely ordinarily honest men, but men of an unimpeachable and delicate sense of honor. As the case now stands, with Mr. Daugherty's own admissions it is apparent that, whatever may be the partisan motives of his Senatorial accusers, his sense of propriety is not over-delicate. His implied excuse that his offense, if any, cannot be a very large one because he received only \$4,000, a sum which gave him no profit but only partly paid the expense he incurred, justifies, we think, this criticism of his delicacy.

It is extremely regrettable, if not dangerous to good government, that an Attorney-General of the United States and a member of the Cabinet should be placed by his own acts in the situation in which Mr. Daugherty now finds himself.

AWARDS OF MERIT

IT has been proposed that there should be a discontinuance for some time of the Nobel prize awards in order to increase the capital sum from which the awards are derived and thereby make the prizes larger, or perhaps enlarge the number and scope of the awards. The latter would seem to be far the more desirable object, for the prizes are already large in money value and there are in the world's field of endeavor untouched possibilities for the recognition of distinguished services to mankind.

Such awards as come from the Nobel foundation, from the French Academy, from the de Goncourt and other French committees, and from the interesting offer by Mr. Bok of a prize of \$10,000 to the citizen who has done the best service to Philadelphia, are valuable, not only as recognition of achievement in art, literature, science, and public advancement, but as encouragement to all who are striving to translate ideals into concrete form and make more common beauty and knowledge and the accomplishing of things worth while.

One is struck, in reading the announcement just made through the Columbia University School of Journalism of the annual awards of its Pulitzer prizes, by the number and scope of the incentives here furnished both to Americans who have achieved and to Americans who are struggling toward achievement. Thus, there are three traveling scholarships of \$1,500 each for the pupils of the school who have done the best work in their courses and two other equally well endowed scholarships for American art and music students of promise and talent. For journalism at large there are awards to the newspaper which has done the most meritorious and distinguished service in the year, to the writer of the best editorial, and to the reporter who has done the best piece of accurate, terse, and valuable journalistic work. This year two of these three prizes fell to men who made the most of the notable opportunity offered by the ceremonies at Washington last Armistice Day over the Unknown Soldier. Mr. Kirke L. Simpson, of the Associated Press, won the reporter's prize; Mr. Frank M. O'Brien, of the New York "Herald," was adjudged to have written of the Unknown Soldier in a way that best stood the tests of clearness of style, moral purpose, sound reasoning, and the power to influence public opinion rightly. Many of our readers will remember Mr. O'Brien's editorial; its opening paragraphs were as follows:

That which takes place to-day at the National Cemetery in Arlington

is a symbol, a mystery and a tribute. It is an entombment only in the physical sense. It is rather the enthronement of Duty and Honor. This man who died for his country is the symbol of these qualities; a far more perfect symbol than any man could be whose name and deeds we knew. He represents more, really, than the unidentified dead, for we cannot separate them spiritually from the war heroes whose names are written on their gravestones. He—this spirit whom we honor—stands for the unselfishness of all.

This, of all monuments to the dead, is lasting and immutable. So long as men revere the finer things of life the tomb of the nameless hero will remain a shrine. Nor, with the shifts of time and mind, can there be a changing of values. No historian shall rise to modify the virtues or the faults of the Soldier. He has an immunity for which kings might pray. The years may bring erosion to the granite but not to the memory of the Unknown.

The jury which made the decision as to the journalistic prizes found that the most noteworthy single public service rendered individually by one newspaper was the New York "World's" series of articles exposing the operations and nature of the revived Ku Klux Klan.

There is always wide interest in the Columbia awards as to literature and the drama. There seems to be general approval of the bestowal of the \$1,000 prize for the American novel "best representing the wholesome atmosphere of life and the highest standards of American manners and manhood" to Mr. Booth Tarkington's "Alice Adams." Many critics would place this novel lower than Mr. Tarkington's "The Magnificent Ambersons," which had already received the same honor; while of course there will be a difference of opinion as to whether one or two other novels of 1921 are not equal in force or dramatic quality to "Alice Adams." But the committee could choose but one, and their choice is creditable. The award of a prize of \$1,000 to Edwin Arlington Robinson for his "Collected Poems" as the best volume of verse put forth during the year is beyond question an admirable decision. Hamlin Garland's "A Daughter of the Middle Border" in the field of biography, Mr. James Truslow Adams's "The Founding of New England" in that of American history, and Mr. Eugene O'Neill's "Annie Christie" in that of play-writing, round out the list of the Columbia awards.

A distribution of tokens of merit such as this is a stimulus to comparison and discussion—a stimulus even if it arouses contradiction. The founder of the prizes made a valuable contribution to the growth of American imaginative activity and a help to American literary and art development.