

# The organs of our own power

(Measure for Measure, Act I, Scene 1)

Alley in the Memphis Commercial Appeal



The procession turned off somewhere!

From Miss Nannie H. Rice, A. & M. College, Miss.

North in the Washington Post



He should have a 5-5-3-man-sized navy

From Cyrus A. Smale, Washington, D. C.

James in the St. Louis Star



"You've no business interfering"

From Anna Brightman, St. Louis, Mo.

Kirby in the New York World



"I claim as much right to recognize a government as you"

From Arthur Phillips, Leonia, N. J.

its body as inconsistent with the Federation's basic ideas about organized labor. In this furriers' strike the Reds got control of the strike, denounced the attempts of the others to make terms with the employers, and settled it themselves after an expenditure for all purposes (according to a statement attributed to Mr. Ryan, of the New York Central Trades Council) of over \$800,000. The allegations as to payments to the police were made before the Federation's investigating committee.

There never was a case in which it was more obviously right to refuse to believe wholesale and startling charges of corruption before the evidence had been thoroughly and publicly sifted.

### Farm Relief

THE fight for "farm relief" is again on in the lower house of Congress, and is likely to continue, intermittently, both there and in the Senate, until the session ends. Advocates of such legislation are more hopeful than they have been before of final success, but most of them are inclined to expect it in the next Congress rather than at this session. That, however, will not prevent strenuous effort from now until March 3.

The new McNary-Haugen Bill has been reported by the House Committee on Agriculture, though it displaced the Crisp-Curtis bi-partisan bill on the crucial test by a vote of only 11 to 10. Later efforts to report the Crisp-Curtis Bill had less support.

The new McNary-Haugen Bill is essentially the same as the two old bills of that name, but with some differences as to the way in which the result of disposing of surpluses is to be brought about. The purpose of the first McNary-Haugen Bill was to dump the surplus abroad at whatever price it would bring, to the end that the domestic price might be stimulated. The second McNary-Haugen Bill was animated by a purpose to make the tariff effective for farmers by manipulating the surplus in such way that tariff protection would apply to the bulk of the crop. The purpose of the present McNary-Haugen Bill is to set up an organization which will dispose of the entire crop—both the portion sold abroad and the bulk consumed at home—to the best possible advantage. The equalization fee feature, however, remains the same. And that is the point around which, more recently at least, the battle has raged.

The Crisp-Curtis Bill, which is generally believed to have a measure of Administration support, is the same in purpose and practically the same in lan-

guage as the McNary-Haugen Bill, except as to the equalization fee. Both bills would establish a revolving fund of \$250,000,000 out of which a Federal board would aid farmers' co-operative organizations in the marketing of crops. Under the Crisp-Curtis Bill, however, return would be made to the Government, not by the assessment of an equalization fee, but from profits made by the co-operatives in the handling of crops.

The farm organizations, in large part, appear to favor the McNary-Haugen Bill. The American Farm Bureau Federation, the Cotton Growers' Exchange, the Corn Belt Federation, and the Executive Committee of Twenty-two have definitely approved it. They maintain that those who formerly opposed farm relief legislation on the ground that it would put the Government in business have now lost sight of that fact in their opposition to the equalization fee feature. These organizations contend that the Crisp-Curtis Bill would have the effect of putting the Government in business, while the McNary-Haugen Bill would not.

### A Yankee Sesqui-Centennial

VERMONT declared its independence a hundred and fifty years ago this month.

It was not one of the colonies to assert liberty and Statehood in 1776. Indeed, then and for fifteen years to come it was a question what Vermont was. It had been called the New Hampshire Grant, and until it was admitted as a State in 1791 its people were involved in complicated quarrels with New Hampshire and New York over land grants and division lines. This little war was not without bloodshed, as witness the "Westminster Massacre." Even after Vermont's declaration of independence in 1777 it was at first called New Connecticut, for many of its people came from the Nutmeg State, and for a time Vermont had claimed sixteen New Hampshire towns east of the Connecticut River.

When, therefore, Ethan Allen and his Green Mountain Boys seized Ticonderoga in 1775, Vermont was practically carrying on an independent war against King George III.

How petty the real issue between New York and Vermont was is seen from the fact that New York agreed in 1790 to accept \$30,000 for its land claims and to withdraw its opposition to the admission of Vermont to the Union—it was the first to come in after the Constitution was adopted.

A delightfully quaint and humorous

picture of Vermont's early days is found in "Danvis Folks," "Uncle Lisha's Shop," and other stories by Judge Rowland E. Robinson, who also wrote a capital book about Vermont in the "American Commonwealth Series."

In celebrating this sesqui-centennial there can hardly be too much said in praise of the hardihood and independence of this mountain community.

### Baseball Still on Trial

HARDLY had the charges of crookedness in baseball in 1917 brought by two ex-players, Risberg and Gandil, been disposed of by Judge Landis than the attack upon Cobb and Speaker began again in a new form. When the new hearing precipitated by a newspaper statement from Ban Johnson, President of the American League, is concluded, baseball fans and the public at large may hope for a cessation of these revivals of the scandals of 1917 and 1919.

As to the hearing on the Risberg-Gandil charges, Judge Landis sustained the assertion of the men attacked and other witnesses that these accusations were false and had no evidence behind them. It is admitted that a purse was made up by players on the Chicago White Sox team and given to players on the Detroit team. It was, however, not a bribe to throw a certain game, but a token of appreciation of the service the Detroiters did them by winning a series of four games in the pennant race against the Boston American team. Thus this reward was a voluntary tribute to the donees for doing their duty and playing their best. In fact, this matter was brought up six years ago and similar charges disproved. Judge Landis properly disapproves of "giving any gift or reward by the players or management of another club for services rendered or supposed to be or have been rendered in defeating a competing club." He also suggests penalties for players making bets on any league ball game, whether their team is engaged or not.

Ban Johnson's newspaper statement shows hostility toward Judge Landis and he says that Landis, and not himself, is responsible for the attack on Cobb and Speaker. Yet he declares that these men will never be allowed to play in or manage an American League Club. Of Cobb he says, "I don't believe Ty Cobb ever played a dishonest game in his life. . . . I love Ty Cobb," but "we let him go because he had written a peculiar letter about a betting deal that he couldn't explain and because I felt that he had violated a position of trust." Johnson talks darkly and mysteriously about Speaker,